



A DISSERTATION

ON

THE EUCHARIST,

WHEREIN ARE PROVED

FROM SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION,

THE REAL PRESENCE,

AND THE

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

BY

REV. R. KELEHER, PR.

OF R. C. C.

Permissu Superiorum.

1872.

ADVERTISER STEAM PRESSES, RICHMOND STREET, LONDON.

A DISSERTATION

THE EUCCHARIST.

WRITTEN AND REVISED

FROM SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

THE REAL PRESENCE

OF THE

SACRIFICE OF THE MASS

BY

REV. H. KENNEDY, B.A.

OF THE

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

1871

ADVANCED NEW SERIES, RICHMOND STREET, LONDON

PREFACE.

It is scarce necessary I should inform my readers, the proofs of the Real Presence and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which are adduced in the following brief summary, will be found orthodox, and entirely in accordance with the teaching of the Church. It will appear they are founded on Scripture and tradition not only, but are even the result of perusing extracts on the same subject, taken from the writings of the most approved, of the most distinguished Theologians, whom God has raised up in a special manner, to defend his doctrine.

The compiler has ventured no opinion of his own ; he has merely condensed the arguments, of the most eminent Doctors aforesaid—scholars, who by their vast erudition by their profound research have placed the Real Presence, the Mass, every dogma of faith, above all cavil exception and contradiction ; from these shining lights who have so illumed the Catholic Church by their teaching, who have shed so much lustre on the Christian world by their doctrine, has he lit his faint burning lamp, from them has he derived his glimmer of knowledge. Be it also observed he has the satisfaction of informing his readers, this, his unpretending little work, is printed with the permission of three learned dignitaries of the Church. May it prove acceptable to a charitable public ; true, it is a feeble essay in the way of literature. "It is a grain in the balance." "It is a jot, an iota," to the treasure of science.

But we are to call to mind, notwithstanding the rich in the abundance of their wealth sacrificed to the Lord of the Temple, whole hecatombs of bulls and goats, the same good Lord would vouchsafe to accept from the poor man the slight offering of a kid ! Let us imitate the condescension, the benignity and mercy of our Creator, like most dear children, as the Apostle writes :

Estote ergo imitantes Dei, sicut filii charissimi.—Ep. Ephes., 5 c., 1 v.

66472

LUCAN, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO,

March 20, 1872. *laus Deo.*

CHAPT. I.

An intelligible and concise dissertation on the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Eucharist in which are proved, 1st. The truth of the Real Presence; 2nd. The truth and reality of the Sacrifice of the Mass, by arguments derived from Scripture tradition and prescription.

It is not necessary to use a long preface, no need of spinning out a proposition to much length in order to comprehend the importance of the subject which is to be discussed, and treated on; the Sacrament and Sacrifice in which J. Christ effuses and reveals the treasures of his love, power and mercy, will be our theme; the Sacrament and Sacrifice which may be deemed the sum and completion of all his wonderful works for our salvation.

1ST PART.

THE VARIOUS NAMES OF THE EUCHARIST.

The many names of the Eucharist are derived from the various things and circumstances which are connected with it and are wont to be observed in it; 1st, from the act by which it is consecrated. It is denominated "Eulogia," or benediction from the scope of that act; it is often called the "Eucharist," or thanksgiving; because at its institution, Christ, our Lord, "gave thanks," Matt. 26, and because by its oblation not any act of religion, better adapted adequately to thank God and to obtain his favors; 2nd, from the matter of which it is made, we call it the bread of the Lord, the bread of Heaven, the bread of Angels; 3rd, from what is contained in the Eucharist, it is called the body of Christ, the Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, the most august Sacrament; 4th, from the time and place of its institution, it is often denominated the Supper and Table of the Lord; by analogy some call it 'Agapa,' or love, because it was distributed at the Love Feasts of the Primitive Christians; 5th, from those who receive it, it is termed 'Synaxis,' a word which signifies uniting and collecting together, because the faithful when assembled received it, because by receiving it, they become united with Christ; and among themselves as members of his body, they become united in the strictest bonds of charity. This is what we are taught by the following words of St. Paul: "Because one bread, one body, we many are, for we all partake of the one bread" (1 Cor. 10, 17). From its effects it is said to be the Sacrament of Grace, the support of life, in the strength of which we journey to a happy eternity; 6th, from its figure it is called the Pasch, Pascha.

THE VARIOUS FIGURES OF THE EUCHARIST.

In the old law there were illustrious figures of the Eucharist; 1st, the matter of the bread and wine was prefigured by the oblation of Melchizedec (Gen. 14). The loaves of proposition to be eaten solely

by the undefiled, were a figure of the Eucharist (1 Kings, c 21). The bread of the first fruits, the hearth cake, which Elias ate, and in the strength of which he journeyed forty days till he reached Mount Horeb (3 Kings, 19), where also figures the Eucharist. By reason of the flesh and blood of Christ contained therein, all Sacrifices of the old law prefigured the Eucharist. This is to be understood especially of the Sacrifice of Expiation, the most solemn of them all, with regard to effect; it was foreshadowed by the Tree of Life planted by the Lord in the midst of Paradise, as the medicine of immortality. It was prefigured by the manna which served the Hebrews for food forty years in the desert. We have an illustrious figure of the Eucharist in the Paschal Lamb. 1st. In the lamb itself slain and eaten. 2nd. In its blood with which the door-posts were sprinkled, for *protection* against the exterminating angel. 3rd. In the unleavened bread used on the occasion of eating the Paschal Lamb. By these three things it was signified Christ was not only to be spiritual food in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, but also, that he was a victim applying to us his merits; finally that the matter of which it is to be made would be unleavened bread and the juice of the grape (Exod. 19). The Holy Fathers treating of the Eucharist, often allude to these figures.

THE INSTITUTION AND DEFINITION OF THE EUCHARIST.

The Eucharist is a Sacrament, for to constitute a Sacrament of the new law, three things are required, "to wit," an outward rite, or visible sign, divine institution, the promise of grace, and these three qualities are found in the Eucharist. It is a sensible rite, under the outward forms of bread and wine, which are typical of invisible grace, or signify the spiritual food, with which the soul is fed in the Eucharist. 2nd. It was instituted by Christ our Lord. Jesus took bread and blessed, and broke, and gave his Disciples, and says, this is my body," (Math. 26) "this do in commemoration of me," (Luc. 22). That grace is annexed to the receiving of the Eucharist, the following words prove most clear: "If any person will eat of this bread he will live forever." (Jn. 6, 52.) In the Eucharist, then, is found every requisite necessary to constitute a Sacrament; this, tradition confirms, as all the Holy Fathers who treat on the Sacraments call the Eucharist by that title. In their Liturgies and Formularies, all Christian societies, as well as Catholics, call it by the same appellation. Christ at the Last Supper, and on the eve of his death, instituted the Eucharist; whether he did this after having first celebrated the legal pasch and on the same day on which the Jews celebrated theirs, is a question warmly debated among Theologians. The affirmative opinion is to be preferred, it being by far the most certain. It is the doctrine of Wittasse, Tourneley, Collet, Drouen, scholars of vast erudition, Theologians of high renown.

The Eucharist is defined, "A Sacrament of the new Law, instituted by Christ our Lord, for the heavenly food of our souls in which are contained under the forms of bread and wine, his body and blood, truly, really, and substantially." The first part of the definition follows

necessarily, from what has been stated with regard to the institution of the Eucharist. The second will appear (will be verified) from what is to be said in proof of the Real Presence. This definition of itself makes it manifest, how, and in what respect the Eucharist differs from the other Sacraments. In them Christ is present only inasmuch as through *their subministration* he communicates his grace and the virtue derived from himself, whereas, in the Eucharist, he, the fountain of all celestial gifts and graces, effuses himself and communicates himself in person, to borrow the Redeemer's own words, with men receiving this Sacrament; he so unites himself, "that they abide in him and he in them." (Jn. 10.) Wherefore S. J. Chrysostum, commenting on this text of Scripture observes, "*Christ in this Sacrament reduces us within himself into one mass, and makes us one not only by faith but in reality.*" *Sed re ip sa !*

2ND PART.

ON THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST.

Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, is to be proved in this sense that in this Sacrament, his flesh and blood, together with his soul and divinity, are truly and really contained under the species or outward forms of bread and wine. It is necessary to speak in advance, a few words; and inform concerning those who in times long passed denied the Real Presence. All they who in the early ages of the Church supposed Christ to have but a phantastic or an *unbodied* form indirectly denied the Real Presence; of these were the Simonians, the Gnostics, the Valentimans, as also the Manicheans; they who with us believed the body of Christ to be real but denied his divinity, as a necessary consequence denied his Real Presence in the Eucharist.

1st. John, sometimes called Scotus (Scotch), sometimes called Erigena (Irish born), is held to be the first who at some period in the 9th century impugned the Real Presence. He died A.D., 884; he left after him a few followers who espoused his doctrine. 2nd. In the 11th century, Berengare, of Turin, and Archdeacon of Andegavin, taught more publicly and disseminated more widely the poisonous doctrine imbibed from the book of Scotus; he is accredited to be the parent of Sacramentarians, *i.e.*, of all who deny the Real Presence. In many Councils sentence of condemnation was pronounced against himself and his doctrine, his heresy he often abjured and as often renewed. After having done penance he died in profession of the true faith, A. D., 1088; he left a few ignoble disciples to maintain his new doctrine.

The Albigenses are not to be taken into account, for according to Bossuet, they were Manicheans! As to the Waldenses, the same illustrious author, in his book on Variations, shows in the beginning they did not err regarding the Eucharist; they were their successors, who in the time of Calvin and Luther, erred in opinion regarding it. Wicklief, who died A.D., 1384, denied Transubstantiation, but admitted the Real Presence. This is what Bossuet affirms of him and testifies in addition

regarding him: "He deemed holiness necessary in a minister that he may *validly* consecrate." John Huss, disciple of Wickliff, expressly confessed the Real Presence; this the same Bossuet records of him who is, himself, he informs us, indebted to Laroque for the intelligence.

Therefore he who openly denied the Real Presence, next after Berengare, was Carlostiad, Archdeacon of Wittenberg, and disciple of Luther; his error of the Figurative Presence he commenced disseminating A.D., 1524. It was soon adopted by Zuinglius, pastor of Zurich, as also by Ecolampad and Bucer, both fallen Friars; to them succeeded Calvin, Chaplain of the Church of Novidien, in France, and in the same Diocese afterwards pastor; openly abjuring the Catholic faith A.D., 1533, he gave name to the second great division of Protestants, well known by the denomination "Calvinists," to condemn this error of the Sacramentarians, wherever it may chance to lurk or lie hid, were it beneath the Episcopal Copē, the Council of Trent hurled her spiritual thunder on all who maintain it and fulminated the following scathing Anathema, denouncing: "If any person will deny, in the Eucharist is contained truly, really and substantially the flesh and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ, and will say he is there only in figure or sign, let him be accursed. Anathema sit.

THE ARGUMENTS, BY WHICH IS PROVED THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S
FLESH AND BLOOD IN THE EUCHARIST.

The arguments adduced in proof of this doctrine are of three kinds, the first is founded on Scripture, the second on tradition, the third on prescription. When on this most important question, no work more perfect, more comprehensive, more convincing, was published, than the one bearing the title, "La perpetuite de la foi de l'Eglise Catholique, touchant l'Eucharist defendue contre le livre, du Sieure Claud, Ministre de Clarenton," i.e., The perpetuity of the faith of the Catholic Church defended against the book of Mister Claud, Minister of Clarenton, and having reference to the Eucharist, that most copious fountain we have approached; the whole work we have read over and over again, with the object that by abbreviating what was copiously, eloquently and forcibly expressed therein, we may preserve as much as it is possible, the force of so many convincing arguments; the passages will be accurately quoted, according to edition published, A.D., 1704. Delahouge Dr. and Profes. sac. Theolog.

The argument in proof of the Real Presence which is derived from Scripture is subdivided into three proofs; the first of which is founded on the words of promise (Jn. 6); the second on the words of the institution (Mat. 26); the third is founded on the teaching of St. Paul, concerning the use and effects of the Eucharist (1 Cor., c. xi).

The Real Presence proved from the 6th chap. of St. Jn. Demonstration.—The true sense of the 6th chapter of John cannot be truly estimated unless its various parts are carefully distinguished; they are

John 6. 63
is the key
Matt 26
20.29

23-

3. The 1st part extends to verse 25 and has reference to the material food with which the Redeemer fed about 5,000 men ; the second extends from verse 25 to verse 51, and has reference to spiritual food, or to a belief in the word Incarnate, for thus Christ speaks of himself (v. 35): "I am the bread of life ; he who comes to me will never hunger ; he who believes in me will never thirst." The third part commences with verse 51, and continues to the end. The Sacramentarians would have this 3rd part, a continuation of the spiritual sense of eating Christ by faith in the word Incarnate ; while on the other hand, almost all Catholics believe, it means the real eating of the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament. I said *almost* all Catholics, because there were found a few, who, to escape the solution of the arguments which are made against Communion in one kind, and which they deemed too difficult of solution, would fain admit Jesus Christ, in chapter 6th of John, did not speak of or at all allude to the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist. With well merited severity Maldonat "rebukes such temporizers" for thus speaking. He says : "Against the sense of Scripture, against the interpretation of the Holy Fathers, against the tacit, yea, rather the expressed consent of the Church," his censure is not deemed severe by most competent authority, and justly as scarce any opinion could be more opposed to the divine word.

The section of the 6th chapter of St. John, on which is founded an indubitable proof of the Real Presence begins thus (v. 22) "The bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, how can he give us his flesh to eat ? Then Jesus said to them, "unless you will eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you will not have life in you ; my flesh is meat indeed, my blood is drink indeed ; he who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him." Therefore many of his disciples hearing, said, "this is a hard speech, and who can hear it ?" but Jesus knowing within himself his disciples murmured about this, said to them, "doth this scandalize you ? If then you will see the Son of Man ascending where he was before."

These words quoted from the 6th chapter of John are most clearly to be referred to the Eucharist, in which case they prove the Real Presence to a demonstration ; from the tenor of the words themselves, they are to be referred to the Eucharist, as likewise from the consent of tradition, and from the inconvenience which would result, if Christ did not there speak of the blessed Eucharist, he speaks of a new kind of food, of a gift to be conferred at a future time ; "the bread which I will give is my flesh." He would not thus speak of *being eaten by faith*, or of believing in his incarnation, which bread, not *he*, but *his father*, hath already given, as may be learned from verse 32, and which the Apostles did already eat, and all who believed in him. That this new bread is the Eucharist, is evident from the words *flesh and blood, eating and drinking*, so often repeated. Words more appropriate, more clear, could not be used to demonstrate the Eucharist, which consists in eating and drinking the body and blood of Jesus Christ. If the Divine Redeemer

wrong
v. 51-52
2056
60-62

at a time subsequent, did not institute a Sacrament, under the species of bread and wine, we would endeavor, somehow, applying it to his death, to eat his flesh and drink his blood, by faith ; but when after the lapse of some time he instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist in which we so manifestly, so truly eat and drink, it would not seem wise forsaking the interpretation which is clear, intelligible and easy, to adopt that which is obscure, metaphorical and difficult to be conceived in the mind. Maldonat.

The constant tradition of the Church has explained these words of the Evangelist, as referring to the Eucharist. Maldonat quotes over 30 Latin Fathers who so interpret them ; he moreover adds, the whole catalogue of Greek Fathers are of the same opinion, even as often as this chapter is mentioned by the Councils of the Church, they refer it to the Eucharist.

1st. The Council of Alexandria proves the truth of the Eucharistic Sacrifice from these words: " Unless you will eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you will not have life in you ;" from the same words, the 2nd Gen. Council of Nice proves the unbloody sacrifice of the altar, to be the true and real body of Christ. Finally the Fathers of the Council of Trent refer to the Eucharist the words " unless you will eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood," and confirm this doctrine, in Sess. 21., c. 1, much inconvenience would be the result. If Christ did not in this chapter speak concerning the Eucharist, a cogent reason for supposing he did speak of it in order to obviate this inconvenience.—Tourneley, in Majorib Prolect, &c. * * * For either it is to be allowed the words of Christ have reference to the Eucharist, or we are to believe the Redeemer made no mention of it before its institution. 2nd. That John, of all the Evangelists, must not have made allusion to it—neither can be admitted. 1st. It was very usual, nay, invariably the custom with the Saviour, to inform his Disciples in advance concerning the mysteries to be fulfilled by himself ; thus, speaking to Nicodemus (Jhn. 3), he promises the institution of baptism, " unless you be regenerated of water and of the Holy Ghost," words, which by their tenor, do not indicate baptism more manifestly than the following words indicate the Eucharist: " Unless you will eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood," &c. Often did he inform the Apostles in advance " he was to be delivered over to the Gentiles, he was to be crucified, he was to be lodged in the bowels of the earth, whence he was to arise glorious, and ascend into heaven, that from thence he may send the Holy Ghost." It is not to be believed J. Christ hath not acted in like manner with regard to the Eucharist, the most excellent pledge of his love toward mankind ; on the contrary, what harmony in the conduct of the Divine Redeemer, how aptly every thing would be disposed, if, in the 5th chapt. of John, his discourse is to be understood of the Eucharist, the promise of giving his flesh and blood, Christ preludes by the miracle of the loaves and fishes ; the minds of his hearers being thus prepared, from v. 25 to 51, he initiates them in the sublime doctrine of faith in his incarnation, which belief

was already confirmed by many miracles, and which was not so seemingly repugnant to be believed as was the belief of "eating his flesh and drinking his blood," which mystery he at length nakedly proposes in these words, "the bread which I will give is my flesh, my flesh is meat indeed, my blood is drink indeed." In this order of things, the wisdom of our Divine Redeemer displays itself in a wonderful manner. We behold him lead his Disciples from the more easy to the more difficult things of belief, wherefore, every word, every act, on the part of Christ, incline us to the belief in his discourse, as related in the 6th chapter of John, a promise of the Eucharist is included.

The singular prerogative with which John, the beloved Disciple, was favored, "to wit," "of resting on the bosom of Christ," requires the discourse in the 6th chapter of his Gospel should include a promise of the Eucharist, "he rested on the bosom of Christ," there he learned by inspiration the knowledge of the most sublime mysteries, and that charity in all its plenitude, which he afterwards divulged. Who can believe he would observe profound silence regarding this most excellent pledge of the Redeemer's love, both in his Gospel and in his Epistles? Therefore, the words of Christ (John vi., 52) are to be understood as referring to the Eucharist.

And having reference to the Eucharist, they irrefragably prove the Real Presence, so long as Christ in his discourse (chap. vi.) speaks of eating himself by faith; down to v. 52 he solely uses the metaphorical word "bread," "*my father gives you true bread from heaven*, for the bread of God is he who comes down from heaven," and certainly this metaphorical expression "bread" suffices and is most apt to signify the spiritual refection of him, who by faith spiritually eats and drinks Christ; but as soon as he speaks of the Eucharist, words, which in a strict sense signify the real eating of him, he repeats and accumulates, he repeatedly calls the Eucharist his flesh and his blood, he makes the Eucharistic feast consist in eating his flesh and drinking his blood; but in the spiritual eating of Christ by faith "his flesh and blood" are not made to appear two distinct things—eating him is not made distinct from drinking him—as Christ by faith is received whole together with his body and blood. Christ therefore intended his words were to be understood in a sense different from eating him by faith, "to wit," in the literal sense of eating his flesh and drinking his blood *really and truly*. It has been proved the words of Christ (John vi.) are promissary of the Eucharist, they must then accord in sense with the words of Institution, "Take and eat, this is my body; drink you all of this, for this is my blood."

That in the institution of the Eucharist the words "eat and drink" signify a real oral eating and drinking of some kind. The Sacramentarians allow, therefore, the eating and drinking spoken of in the words of promise, signify a real oral eating and drinking. If it were not manifest, the discourse of Christ (John vi.) when once understood of the Eucharist, conveyed (implied) a sense of the Real Presence, why do Sacramentarians strain every nerve to make it appear it is not to be understood as having reference to the Eucharist? why invent such obscure, such

distorted explanations of this discourse to make it apply to the Incarnation?

That the words of promise (John vi.) designate (mean) a real oral presence in an obvious and natural sense is proved from the scandal of the Caphernaïtes, and from Christ's answer, as long as he said of himself only "I am the bread of life;" of this the Caphernaïtes did not complain, until he added, "who has come down from heaven," then they murmur and say, "Is he not the son of Joseph? * * * How then doth he say I have come down from heaven?" (v. 42). But as soon as he informs them "the bread which he will give is his flesh," then the Jews contend fierce among themselves, some affirming it, some denying it and saying with contempt, "how can he give us his flesh to eat?" (v. 53). Now the question changes, a doubt of a new kind arises, viz., concerning the eating of his flesh which Christ proposes, and which they deem impossible, wherefore they no longer understand a mere spiritual eating of his flesh and blood, which *afore* they heard without a murmur; but they understood a real oral eating of him in the Sacrament, and what is the reply of J. Christ's? So far from removing this new kind of doubt, which would be very easy to do if he meant a figurative presence, he confirms it the more by repeating four or five times, "*his flesh was to be eat and his blood was to be drank*," v. 54, 55, when his saying seemed *hard* to many of his disciples, who, in consequence of there believing in him, had already eaten him *by faith*, and, notwithstanding, murmured at this, he by no means proclaims to them; his style of speech (his manner of speaking) was but a more ample, a more full explanation of that eating by faith which they had already acknowledged; on the contrary, he thus addressed them: "Doth this offend you, what then if you will see the Son of Man ascending where he was before?" as if he would say, according to the interpretation of the ablest commentators, "this scandalizes you, while yet I am with you, that I, personally present, assume to give you my flesh to eat and my blood to drink! How much more incredible will it seem to you when you will see me ascending into heaven, and when I will be absent from this earth." These two explanations of the words of Christ, well suited to the subject on which he treated, evidently confirm the meaning of the Real Presence. When his Disciples hesitated to admit the truth of his promise, he confirmed them by the future miracle of his ascension. Now, would it be necessary to have recourse to so great a miracle to confirm them in the belief of eating him spiritually by faith, especially when we consider the great many miracles he had already performed, and particularly the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes?

It is evident, then, both from the scandal of the Caphernaïtes, and from the Redeemer's answer to them, his words of promise in reference to the Eucharist, signify a real oral eating and drinking of his flesh, and blood.

Objections many are made against this proof; we are told what is read in chapter vi. of S. John, even from v. 52 to the end, may be easily

understood of a spiritual eating of Christ by faith. In Scripture the metaphor often occurs which signifies faith in God or in Christ, when the words "food, and drink, bread and wine" refer to them, thus in Proverbs, chapter ix., it is written, "come ye, eat my bread, drink my wine which I have mixed for you." J. Christ, in his discourse with the Samaritan woman indicates the grace he will give by the words, "water and springing fountain," nay, in the very chapt. of John, he uses the metaphor of receiving him by faith, e. g., "this is the bread descending from heaven, if any person *will eat of it*, he will not die," v. 50, 51, in the same sense, Revel. xxii, 17, it is written, "let him who thirsts come, let him who will, receive the waters of life freely."

2nd. The argument derived from Christ's speaking in the future is of no avail, "to wit," "the bread which I will give you." In verse 27 he spoke of a food which the Son of God was to give; this food signifies *good works*, of this he informs us himself, saying, "labour not for the food which perishes, but for that which remains to life eternal, which the Son of Man will give you." Finally Christ declares, v. 57, "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him," and this mutual abiding of Christ in him "who eats him, and of the person eating him in Christ, is entirely *spiritual*, so is also the *eating*."

That these and similar objections may be solved, it is to be noticed the force of our proof or argument does not depend on the explanation of one or more words, but rests on the continued interpretation of the 3rd part of the 6th chapt. of S. John, which is the more notable part; now every verse of this third part, taken collectively or separately, lend each other mutual assistance to indicate the manner of Christ spoken of in the 3rd part, is entirely different from that eating which is mentioned in the preceding part, wherefore although faith in God, or in the word Incarnate, may be sometimes designated or expressed by the terms "eating and drinking," "wine and water." It does not follow these metaphors would be multiplied and accumulated in the continuation of the 3rd part of 6th John, to signify merely a spiritual eating of Christ, or faith in him.

Answer to 2nd objection.—There evidently Christ speaks in a metaphorical sense, when he bids his hearers "labour for the bread which perisheth not;" they who stood present understood him to speak of good works, which sense he himself confirmed afterwards, if he adds, "he will give this food;" by this he would have it merely to be understood, all good works derive their value or fruit from the anticipated merits of his own future passion.

Answer to 3rd objection.—When Christ informs us "he who eats his flesh and drinks his blood, abides in him and he in the person" who receives, here he speaks of the effects of the Eucharist, which are spiritual indeed, whilst at the same time the eating of him is not spiritual, thus in Baptism and in the other Sacraments, grace is not derived from an external and material rite. Many of the Holy Fathers from these words of Christ inferred, not only a *spiritual* abiding of him in us, but a *real* indwelling of him in the person who receives him in the

Eucharist, for in this Sacrament the eating of him is real; it is thus Cyril, of Alexandria, explains the words of Christ.

It is objected the Caphernaïtes could not understand Christ to speak of a real oral eating of him in the Eucharist, without understanding he meant they were to eat and drink his flesh and blood, as if he were a slaughtered victim; yet this erroneous meaning of his words Christ did not correct. 2nd. Without justice, it is said, Christ did not correct this sense of the real eating of him, which the Caphernaïtes ascribed to his words. He expressly excludes that sense in the following text: "It is the spirit quickeneth, the flesh availeth nothing; the words which I have spoken are spirit and life," 63.

3rd. The Caphernaïtes, understanding how sublime the mysteries were which he propounded to them, should prudently wait for an explanation ere arriving at any conclusion, and, therefore, though the sense they attached to his words was false, Christ was not obliged to correct it nor to explain himself more fully.

To these objections, answer is thus made: 1st. The Caphernaïtes could not understand Christ to speak of a real eating of his flesh, without inferring the eating of him was to be bloody, because they rashly interpreted and pronounced on the manner of eating him, of which Christ did not say a word. *How*, or in *what manner* he was to be eaten they should not examine into. The fearful error of these people regarding the bloody manner of eating Christ's flesh, as is eaten the flesh sold at the shambles, arose from their proceeding beyond the meaning of Christ's words; in the clearest, plainest words, he informed them "*his flesh was to be eaten and his blood was to be drank*," really, truly and substantially; as to the manner in which he was to be eaten, he observed entire silence; the kind of eating which first occurred to their mind, viz., that he was to be eaten like common food, was absurd, and should at once be rejected, considering the person of him who spoke, who declared his mission to be divine, and proved it such by innumerable miracles. The error, then, is to be imputed to themselves and not to the Divine Redeemer—nor was he obliged to correct their error by explaining to them the mode in which he was to be eaten.

Answer to 2nd objection: The words which Christ speaketh (v. 64), "It is the spirit gives life; the flesh availeth nothing," are to be understood as a general sentence by which he breaks off his discourse, and bids his hearers remember "the mysteries of God are not to be judged according to human reason, but are to be believed on his authority revealing them." In this chapter, whenever Christ speaks of his flesh he invariably uses the pronoun "my"—*my flesh, my blood, the flesh of the Son of Man, his blood*—but in this passage without the pronoun "my," he merely affirms "*the flesh availeth nothing*," therefore he does not speak of his flesh, but of carnal affections. In the same sense the Apostle Paul writes (1 Cor. 11, 14): "*Animalis homo non percipit ea quæ sunt spiritus Dei*;" i. e., the natural man receives not the things which are of the Spirit of God. Even if these words were to be understood

as referring to the flesh of Christ, the only inference deducible from it is, the real eating of his venerable flesh in the Sacrament will avail us nothing, unless we receive Christ in spirit and in faith, and this no person will deny.

Answer to 3rd objection: It is false to say Christ was not obliged to correct the sense of a real and oral manducation of his flesh and blood, which the Caphernaïtes ascribed to his words, although it were erroneous; because on account of the sublimity of his doctrine, they should prudently wait for some explanation, of the sense in which he spoke before making any assertion, before arriving at any conclusion regarding it. From such a principle it would follow the Apostles were not to believe Christ concerning his divinity, his death, his resurrection, his ascension, concerning regeneration, &c., until he explained to them how these mysteries were to be fulfilled. Nothing more preposterous could well be imagined.

It is urged still J. Christ may not deem it expedient to correct the sense of a real oral eating of him, which the Caphernaïtes attributed to his words, although it were false, for on a similar occasion, after expelling from the Temple "those who sold oxen and doves and sheep," being questioned by the Pharisees "what sign showest thou to us, seeing thou doest these things?" Jesus answered and said, "destroy this Temple, and in three days I will build it." (Jn. ii, 18, 19.) These words of Christ the Pharisees indubitably understood of the material Temple of Jerusalem, and that there may not remain a shadow of doubt of the sense in which they understood them, they answered "46 years was this Temple in building, and thou sayest in three days I will build it again." Yet this erroneous sense of his words Christ did not correct. So in like manner he was not obliged to correct the false sense which the people of Caphernaam ascribed to his words.

Answer. There is a disparity, the cause of which is threefold. 1st. The person which Christ represented on both these occasions was entirely different. 2nd. His manner of acting was different. 3rd. The event was manifestly different. In his discourse to the people of Caphernaam (Jn. vi.), he spoke in the person of a divine teacher, whose duty was openly to announce his doctrine, on whom it was incumbent to propound it clearly, distinctly and in words easily understood by his hearers; whereas in the Temple, being insolently questioned by the Pharisees in what power he drove out the buyers and sellers, he enigmatically answers them by referring to the sign of his future resurrection, which he was wont to give as the most splendid argument (proof) of his divine mission; but always in phrase shrouded in obscurity, lest the mystery should be divulged before the due time; accordingly in Math. xii. he proclaims it under the figure "of Jonas the Prophet who was in the whale's belly three days and three nights."

2nd. Far different did Christ act on those occasions, which are compared. In the Temple, when the Jews understood him to speak of the material Temple of Jerusalem, he did not add one word to confirm this

sense or meaning, whereas the real oral sense which the Caphernaites attributed to his words, he confirmed time and again, and in terms so clear, so patent, that many of his Disciples who had thus far believed in his teaching, now "went back and walked with him no more."

3rd. Very different the event, great the disparity in what followed : the true sense of Christ's answer in the Temple was ascertained after his resurrection, "for when he arose from the dead his Disciples remembered he spoke this of the temple of his body, and they believed the word which Jesus hath said." (Jn. ii., 22.) But in the four Gospels we read nothing before or after his resurrection which would explain his words of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, in a figurative sense, or that they signify "to eat and drink him by faith." Indeed, this real oral eating of him is confirmed by the Apostle Paul as (1 Cor. xi., 24) will be proved ; no comparison then can be instituted between the answer of Christ in the Temple to the Pharisees, and his discourse to the people of Caphernaam, concerning "eating his flesh and drinking his blood." John 6.

Some objections are proposed from the writings of the Holy Fathers, but a few principles will solve them. 1st. They of the Fathers who from the words of Christ would seem to exclude the Real Presence, or eating his flesh and drinking his blood, verily and indeed, exclude it only in the sense of the Caphernaites, who believed the eating to be bloody, or that his body was to be eaten, as persons eat the flesh which is bought and sold at the market, that his flesh was to be masticated with the teeth ; 2nd. Admitting the literal sense of the words of Christ, understanding them to mean a real eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, nevertheless the Fathers could interpret them in a mystical sense, which would refer to a spiritual eating through faith when a dogma is *safe*; the Fathers often indulge their fancy in elucidating a mystical meaning from it, when seemingly necessary for the advancement of Christian morals, so S. Augustine in particular is to be understood.—De La Houge.

3rd. The Holy Fathers, it is to be admitted, did not argue much to prove the Real Presence from the 6th Chapt. of S. John, but from this it must not be inferred they did not understand the words of Christ in their obvious and literal sense, or that they did not believe in the Real Presence, taking into account the persons whom they instructed, they believed a more ready, a more convincing proof could be derived from the words of Institution, which are so plain as to need no comment or explanation.—Wittase and Collet, Theolog.

2ND PROOF.

THE REAL PRESENCE PROVED FROM THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION.

The institution of the Blessed Sacrament is thus related by S. Matthew, chap. xxvi. 26, "As they were supping, Jesus took bread and broke and gave to his Disciples, and saith *this is my body*, and taking the chalice he gave thanks and presented it to them saying, for this is *my blood* of the New Testament which will be shed for many, unto the remission of

sins." Almost the same form of words occurring in Marc. c. xiv., in Luc. c. xxii., in 1st Ep. of Paul to Cor. c. xi.

The words, "*this is my body, this is my blood,*" incontrovertibly prove the Real Presence in the sense of Catholics; this is so true that if J. Christ were resolved to reveal this dogma, if he intended proclaiming it to mankind, he could not use clearer or more expressive words. Let us suppose Christ, when at the marriage of Cana in Galilee, he changed water into wine, pointing to the waterpots with his hand hath said, "this is wine!" who of those present on the occasion would any longer suppose there was water in them? Would not all believe they contained wine? Now the words of Institution have the same force, the same significancy to prove instead of bread and wine, we have present *the body and blood of Christ*; they so proclaim, so express a reality of presence that he indeed must do violence to his judgment who undertakes to change this sense.

All Christians down to the 9th Cent. understood these words in the sense of the Real Presence—John Scotus, and he alone, explained them otherwise, after the lapse of 200 years—Berengare followed in the devious course of John, whose error, abjured by himself, Carlostad, Ecolompad, Zuingle, renewed in the 16th century. The latter informs us he subjected his understanding to the rack (to torture), that he may discover how to change these words from their plain literal sense of a real presence to an obscure and equivocal figure, or "*trope.*" Luther would seem to believe in the Real Presence. "This I will not deny," he says, "if Carlostad or any other man these 5 years passed could persuade me in the Eucharist there is nothing but bread and wine, I would feel indebted to him for a great favour, in this affair labouring much, with all my nerves on the stretch to extricate myself (from the sense of the Real Presence), as I well knew this would greatly incommode the Papacy; but I see myself caught and no way of escape left, the text of the Gospel being too plain, too manifest, and not to be changed, much less can it be wrested into a figurative sense by words and glosses."—Author of Perpetuity of Faith, Tom 1st.

Finally the Sacramentarians themselves bear testimony to the fact, the words of Institution not only savour of a Real Presence in the Eucharist, but are fraught with it, for having denied the Real Presence they have laboured hard to find some reality, some meaning in the words, which howsoever they explain (besides the true way), have nothing in them real or solid. Whence come their many and vain attempts to explain these words, unless from the fact that they obtrude on them even against their will, the sense (meaning) of a Real Presence?—Bossuet.

Christ intended and wished the words which he spoke when instituting the Eucharist, would be understood in their obvious and natural sense.

To undertake to prove this, as if there could arise any rational doubt concerning it, would indeed be an affront to divine wisdom, as in a matter of such importance it could not be supposed or believed, God

so spoke, that as a consequence he would necessarily lead men into error ; nevertheless, our adversaries impose it as a duty on us Catholics, to show that Christ intended, his words were to be understood in their obvious and literal sense. 1st. This he must intend by reason of the office he fulfilled at the last supper ; he then propounded a dogma of faith, he enacted a law to be always observed, he bequeathed the rich legacy of his charity to mankind, whom he was soon to redeem with his blood. Of the dogma he proposed he was not to say aught in future in the way of explanation ; then, as a divine teacher, he should so announce his doctrine as from his words, to preclude all erroneous sense ; as a divine legislator he should propose his law without equivocations or obscurity ; as the best of fathers he should so make his will that no cause of quarrelling or contention would afterwards arise among his children, wherefore what he had in mind he should express in the plainest words, in words the sense of which could not be mistaken or controverted. 2nd. On account of his Apostles, Christ should use words the meaning of which could not be misunderstood or doubted ; he now called them "friends (Jn. 15) to whom he must no more speak in parables," as now it belonged "to them to know the mysteries of God," c. 16. At the time of instituting the Eucharist, he ordained them priests and ministers, wherefore he should inform them of its most inward substance.

3rd. For the sake of all Christians to the end of time, to whom he propounded this dogma, to whom he proposed this law, this testament of his love, he should use words, the sense of which could not be questioned. How many of them were "little ones" to whom his mysteries were to be revealed, in preference "to the wise and prudent," Math. xi., 25. They were then to be instructed by Christ, in words plain and simple, which would announce the dogma, the law, the last will of him without equivocation or obscurity ; the Redeemer, in knowledge far surpassing all teachers, all legislators who do not foresee but by conjecture, was well aware in advance what the disposition of his Disciples would be ; he knew in what sense, after the lapse of ages, the words of Institution would be received, he foresaw they were to be understood by all Christians for 15 centuries in the sense of the Real Presence, which having elapsed, a few men with little authority, dividing and distracting the Church, despising her law and discipline, rise up in opposition to the constant faith of Councils, Popes and Bishops, who could believe the Redeemer Christ foreseeing all this, would so speak, that only these few men would alone comprehend the meaning of his words, who will believe he would use words which must necessarily lead all others into error, pastors and people alike, whose constant prayer was and always hath been, they may "know his will and do it."—Auctor pepetuit fidei, Tom. 1st.

1st. All figure is excluded from the eating of his flesh, which Christ promised in John vi., for *there* is promised a manducation which in the Eucharist should take place, and actually *did* take place, and the Sacramentarians allow a real oral manducation in the Eucharist, wherefore a

real oral eating of Christ's flesh was promised in John vi., not a spiritual eating of it. 2nd. On the other hand, the thing eaten in the Eucharist is that which Christ promised to be eaten (John vi.), and he promised his true and real flesh was to be eat, *i. e.*, himself whole, the word incarnate as Protestants themselves avow; therefore what is eaten in the Eucharist is the true and real flesh of the word incarnate, nor be it affirmed there is in this mode of arguing a vicious circle, for a vicious circle consists in proving the same by the same. This cannot be alleged in our case; the manner of eating is entirely different from the substance of the thing *to be eat*. In our proof, the way Christ is to be eaten, *i. e.*, truly and substantially, is shown from the words of Institution; the substance of the thing eaten is determined from the words of promise, therefore there is no vicious circle in our argument.—De la Houge, Dr. Sorb. Prof. Sac. Theol.

THIRD PROOF.

THE REAL PRESENCE, PROVED FROM THE TEACHING OF S. PAUL,
REGARDING THE USE AND EFFECTS OF THE BLESSED EUCHARIST.

I COR. XI., 24., &c.

Demonstration—In this chapter the Apostle speaks expressly of the Eucharist, and speaks, he tells us (v. 23), "what he received of the Lord." Quoting the words of Institution, he thus proceeds (v. 27), "Wherefore whoever will eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; let man examine himself, and then eat of that bread and drink of that chalice, for who eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh the judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord, wherefore many among you are sick, feeble, and many sleep." 1 Cor. xi, 27, 28.

These words on the use and effects of the Eucharist most assuredly confirm the sense of the Real Presence: 1st. To the sin of unworthily receiving the Eucharist the Apostle annexes this singular enormity, that in consequence thereof "*he becomes guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*," or in other words, sins against the very body and blood of J. Christ. 2nd. He also denotes the special consequence of the sin and its awful punishment, for he adds, the person who commits the sin eats and drinks judgment to himself, or unites it intimately to his substance, and in this life even is visited with temporal afflictions, yea, is chastised with death, "*et dormiunt multi*," (v. 30), therefore the Apostle demands the most strict, the most thorough, the most exact preparation on the part of him who receives this sacrament. All this we can well understand, admitting the Real Presence in the Eucharist, but if for the Real Presence we substitute a Figurative Presence, we discover in the words of the Apostle but a mere puerile exaggeration, a misplaced hyperbole, which, with equal reason, could be urged against unmerciful Christians, who, deaf to the cries of the poor, refuse all aid (alms) to their brethren in their distress, against those heartless reprobates, to whom, on the last day, J. Christ will address these reproachful words, "I was hungry, and you gave me not to eat; I was thirsty, and you gave me not to drink.

* * * As much as you have not done it to any of those little ones, nor have you done it unto me," Math. xxv., 45. In this solemn condemnation there is some reason for asserting they who are unmerciful to the poor are become guilty of the body and blood of the Lord J. C. If in the Eucharist we had but a figure of Christ's precious flesh and blood, the same punishment may be fulminated against any mortal sin as against the unworthy receiving of it.—Chevassu, 5th Conference.

Our Protestant brethren object, "In Scripture the forms of expression are common, which give to the sign, the name of the thing signified, even at its institution, thus circumcision, which was a sign of the covenant 'twixt God and Abraham, when instituted, is called the covenant (pactum), 'this is my covenant which you shall observe,'" Gen. xvii.

Accordingly the Paschal Lamb (Exod. xii.) is called the *phasē*, or passing over of the Lord when he slew the first-born of the Egyptians, although it was but a sign of this fearful calamity; in like manner Christ, instituting the Eucharist, could say of the bread which he took *as a sign* of his body, "this is my body." Christ said of himself he was the *vine, the door, the bread which came down from heaven*, in 1 Ep. Cor. x. Of the prodigies wrought in the desert in favor of the Israelites, the Apostle Paul thus speaks: "All did eat the same spiritual food, all drank the same spiritual drink, but they drank of the spiritual rock which followed them, and the rock was Christ." If, then, the Apostle could say of Christ abruptly, "*he was the rock of the desert*," from which the Hebrews drank, as well could the Redeemer Christ say of the bread which he held in his hands, *it was his body*. These are the principal objections which Sacramentarians advance against the Real Presence.

Answer.—All such questions are solved by one and the same principle, "*videlicet*," that there is no parity, when from the universal judgment of mankind not any exists, which judgment is the surest test of pronouncing what the force and propriety of words may be, and from the common judgment of mankind, it is ascertained the figurative speech which would be attributed to Christ, instituting the Eucharist, would differ *toto cælo*, the whole breadth of heaven, from the figures in the Old and New Testament which are objected. No person of a sane mind did yet exist, or ever will exist, who believed circumcision to be the covenant of God with Abraham, or that the Paschal Lamb was the "passing over" of the Lord when he slew the first-born of the Egyptians; no person ever believed Christ was a real vine, a material door, or the rock of the desert, of the water issuing from which the Israelites and their cattle drank; whilst, on the contrary, the whole Christian world down to the 16th century believed Christ changed the Eucharistic bread and wine into his own body and blood; as manifest, then, to the human understanding is it, as the disk of sun to the eye, there is no similarity between the figurative language which may be attributed to Christ's instituting the Eucharist, and all those figurative expressions which are objected. Now each objection in particular will be solved.

1st. With respect to circumcision, God hath already promised

Abraham "he would be the father of a great nation ; in him all nations were to be blessed " (Gen. xii., 13). The same promise he renewed in his behalf (c. xvii), and moreover added, "you will circumcise the flesh of your præpuce, that it may be a sign of the covenant between me and you." From the context of these words, it is manifest circumcision was called the paction of the covenant, inasmuch as it was the sign of the covenant ; to assign it any other sense or meaning would be absurd.

2nd. As to the Paschal Lamb, which is called *phasê* (passover), Exod. xii., 22, *imolate phasê*. In this form of speech there is evidently what grammarians term "a hebreism," and the victim of the *phasê* or passover is to be supplied, is understood, as we read it in v. 26, 27, "when your children will say to you, what is this religion? you will say to them, it is the victim of the Passover of the Lord." The paschal lamb may be denominated *phasê* (passover), in the same sense we term peace-offering *pacificum*, or sin-offering *peccatum*, therefore, any person may see at a glance how false, how absurd for Zuingle to say "he never could rest satisfied in his belief of the figurative presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, nor in the figurative sense in which he understood his words, until he felt the force of the argument derived from the figure of the Paschal Lamb, termed '*phasê*.'" This information, he tells us, he acquired in his sleep from a spirit, which he knew not whether it was black or white ; I would rather think it was black, as it is the gloomy spirit of darkness alone could suggest an error in faith so manifest, so palpable, so much at variance with divine revelation.

3rd. The various figures of the vine, door and bread, and those other figures under which Christ designates himself, were plain to all ; from the occasion and adjuncts of time, he moreover explains himself in them.

4th. Finally, the words of the Apostle, "the rock (of the desert) was Christ," (1 Cor. x.) The Apostle calls the rock of which he speaks, and which followed the Israelites in the desert, *spiritual*, which cannot be predicated of a material immoveable rock. He immediately adds, v. 10, "all these happened *in figure*; they are written for our instruction," which words leave the Corinthians to infer figurative language is used in the text. If Moses, seeing the rock of the desert, abruptly, and without previous enquiry, hath said, "*this is the Messiah*," such a form of expression would indeed be deemed equivalent to the words of Christ, *this is my body*; but such language, uttered by Moses to designate the Future Messiah, would be deemed the raving of a person dreaming or delirious.—De La Houge, and Prof. of Sac. Theolog.

It is urged, moreover, by our opponents, Christ sufficiently admonished his Apostles, the words of Institution were to be understood in a figurative sense. 1st. A little previous he informed them, "the poor you will always have with you, but me you will not *always* have *with you*," (Math. xxvi.) When instituting the Eucharist, he bids them consecrate it "in commemoration of him." After the consecration he

still calls the contents of the chalice, "*genimen vitis*," the juice of the vine, v. 29.

Answer 1st. Christ excludes not every real presence of himself; he only excludes that which does not present itself to the human eye, or which falls not under the senses, and which was peculiar to him as to any other mortal. The words which follow clearly confirm this interpretation, v. 12: "For pouring this ointment on my body, she hath done it for my burial."

Answer 2nd. Remembrance does not imply absence, but forgetfulness; men forget God every day, although in him we live, and he fills all places with his immensity; the reason, because his presence is not visible nor apprehended by our senses.

When Christ was soon to withdraw his visible presence from the Apostles, and when he was no more to be seen by them in human form, he admonishes them that as often as they celebrate the Eucharist, wherein he would really be present, they were to remember his visible presence while here on earth, and also all the divine mysteries he fulfilled while here below, of which the Eucharist was a true memorial, wherefore the words of Christ, "this do in commemoration of me," are not to be deemed interpretive of these words, "*this is my body*," they are declarative only of the pious affections of the mind, as often as the Eucharist is received or consecrated; what Christ adds with regard to "the new wine" he was to drink with the Apostles in the kingdom of heaven, is manifestly figurative "of the spiritual joy, and of the torrent of pleasure with which they were to be inebriated," Ps. 35, for in heaven he will not drink with his Apostles either "juice of wine or his blood."—Maldonat, comment.

It is objected by the Protestant Minister, Claud, the dogma of the Real Presence not only distracts the mind of man with its novelty, but by its obscurity, by its apparent repugnance, strikes it with horror; admitting this, two things must be observed in the conduct of Christ and his Disciples, which show the Redeemer did not teach the Real Presence of his body in the Eucharist, nor that the Apostles understood his words in that sense.

1st. It was usual with him in his discourses to explain for his Apostles what seemed obscure and enigmatic to them, yet he did not prepare them for a doctrine so sublime and mysterious, nor did he afterwards say anything to explain it or confirm it. 2nd. The Apostles, at the time of the last Supper, received the words of Christ, "this is my body, this is my blood," as if they implied something very ordinary; they express no surprise, they do not question the Redeemer as to the sense of his words, and when we take into consideration, human affections, especially the disposition of the Apostles, it is difficult to comprehend how they would not seem disturbed and confused in mind, and why they did not question him, if they understood he spoke of a Real Presence. We read in the Gospel of their asking him many questions concerning things easy to be understood, such, e.g., as "the ferment of

the Pharisees," (Math. 16), "the indissolubility of marriage," (Marc x.)

Answers.—It was usual with Christ to explain for the Apostles what seemed obscure and hidden in his words, as to their sense or meaning ; but the substance of his doctrine, when he treated on mysteries, he was not wont to explain. It is false to affirm, likewise, the Redeemer was in the habit of explaining the sublime mysteries he revealed, in order to render them more acceptable (credible). When he speaks of the mysteries of his incarnation, passion, death and resurrection, he merely propounds them ; nor does he explain or discuss them. This would contradict the analogy of "faith, which is the substance of things to be hoped, the argument of things not appearing" (Heb. ii. 1) ; the expositions offered to consideration by the Redeemer had reference to parables, the sense of which his disciples did not comprehend, or they referred to moral precepts and councils, the practice of which they deemed too hard.

2. It is false to say Christ did not prepare the minds of his disciples for the doctrine of the Real Presence at the Last Supper ; for the words of "promise" (Jn. vi.) spoken a whole year in advance of the "institution," and promissary of this mystery, evidently convey the sense of a real presence. The eve before his death, Christ prefaced the institution of the Eucharist by magnificent words, which proclaimed some precious gift was to be left by him, as a future pledge of his divine love ; "with a desire have I desired to eat this pasch with you," he says, "before I suffer." (Luc xx.) Such a sublime preamble may well be deemed a puerile hyperbole (fustain), if the gift were only an empty figure of his body.

3. It is equally false to say the Apostles, if they understood the sense of the Real Presence, should seem astonished and interrogate Christ concerning it. No person will deny, at the time of the last supper, the Apostles firmly believed in the divinity of Christ, and therefore in his omnipotence. Christ favored them with special graces that they may receive the Eucharist worthily. Denouncing one of them as a traitor, sufficiently demonstrates the rest were well disposed, were sufficiently confirmed and enlightened from within, with a firm and simple faith to believe in the mystery of the Real Presence, to them so clearly revealed, and which he then celebrated. If it be urged the Apostles ought to feel a natural horror, when Christ presented to them his blood to drink, for this they were already prepared ; being after receiving his body under the form of bread, which retained the same color and taste ; a like miracle they should believe would happen, when they were to receive his blood under the species of wine. The Apostles are not to be supposed liable to be distracted with such doubts, as now they were confirmed in grace. Especially were they not liable to be distracted if the blessed Christ himself received the Eucharist, as is generally believed ; "his example," saith Chrysostom, "should remove far from them all vain fears."—*Auctor Perpetuit Fidei, Tom 2nd.*

SECOND ARGUMENT.

THE REAL PRESENCE PROVED FROM TRADITION.

If we are to credit the so-called Reformers, especially the Calvinistic portion of them, the Church, in the primitive ages of its existence, understood the words of institution in a figurative sense. In more recent times, they allege, the dogma of the Real Presence was introduced; of him who effected the change they inform us not. To prove the dogma of the Real Presence is an innovation. Aubertin, one of their ablest ministers, published an immense work, in which he accumulated many texts of the Fathers of the early ages, and attempted explaining them in a figurative sense. The author of "Perpetuity of the Faith" refuted this work; for, examining each text, he proves every Father, every ecclesiastical writer whom Aubertin quotes, both held and taught the Real Presence.—*De la Houze and Bouvier, Drs. Theolog.*

What the author of the "Perpetuity of the Faith" hath copiously written to sustain the argument of the Real Presence from tradition, will be contracted, will be so briefly explained that in the mind no doubt will remain. The doctrine of the Real Presence was the belief of all Christians in every age from the time of the Apostles to that of the Reformers; and whereas Protestants allow this belief to be common among all Christian communities of the latter ages of the Church, what the faith of Christians was in regard to it from the first age of the Church down to the sixth will be only examined and minutely discussed.—*idem Auctores.*

Demonstration.—From the writings of the Holy Fathers of the six first ages of the Church, it will be evidently proved they believed in and taught the Real Presence, and that all the faithful understood their words in the same sense.

Ignatius, Disciple of the Evangelist John, and 3rd Bp. of Antioch, who died martyr, A.D. 105, in a letter he wrote to the people of Smyrna, styles the Eucharist "The flesh of our Lord J. Christ, which suffered for us." *Carnem Salvatoris nostri, que pro nobis passa est*; he moreover writes, "many heretics who denied *real flesh* was assumed by the word, abstained from celebrating the Eucharist, so persuaded were the people of the time, it was the real body of Christ." In his book 4, against Heresies, c. xxxii., St. Irenæus writes: "These heretics contradict themselves, who at the same time detract from the true flesh of Christ, and celebrate the Eucharist." Irenæus died martyr, A.D. 205.

St. Justin, Philosopher, in his youth a Gentile, and who died martyr A.D. 160, in a second apology which he published A.D. 150, speaking of the Christian assemblies of his time, and of the celebration of the Eucharist, makes use of the following words: "This (the Eucharist), we take not as common bread and wine, but as a food, whence our blood and flesh are nourished, by a change. *We are taught to believe it is the flesh and blood of Christ, Incarnate.* Tertulian, who died A.D. 218, aged 81 years, calls the Eucharist, 'The body and blood of Christ, with which our soul is fed.' See his book on the Resurrection of the

Flesh. Cyprian, who died martyr, A.D. 263, writes: "The bread, which our Lord gave his Disciples being changed, not in *shape*, but in *substance*, through the omnipotence of the word, is *made flesh*." St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, who flourished A.D. 350, in a work titled the Mystical Catechism (part 4), styles the Eucharist, "The body of the Author of Heaven, the body and blood of Christ, by which we are made of the same body and blood with Christ, his flesh and blood being distributed into our members." St. Ambrose, Bp. of Milan, and who flourished A.D. 384, in his book on the Initiated (Baptized), chap. 9, terms the Eucharist "The body of the Author of Heaven, which is of the Virgin Mary, the flesh which was crucified and buried." St. Chrysost, who died A.D. 395, 29th Homily, on chap. ii., 1x Cor., denominates the Eucharist "The body of Christ pierced with nails, perforated with a lance, which being in a manger, the Magi revered;" finally, St. Augustine calls it, "The flesh which he *received* of Mary."

From these quotations, it is evident the above particularized Fathers believed in the Real Presence; clearer or plainer words they could not use to express their belief in it, not any of our modern Bishops or Priests could use words, which in a more natural and obvious sense would more truly convey their belief in this mystery; these Fathers, with whom the others concur, speak of a practical dogma, or of a sacrament to be received by all the faithful. It is to be supposed therefore, they spoke in such a style as could be understood by the most simple hearers, consequently, when in reference to the Eucharist, they use words, which in their obvious and natural sense signify a Real Presence, they believed in it themselves and proposed it as such to be believed in by the faithful; no other sense could they ascribe to their words.

2ND PROOF.

Demonstration.—A proof in favour of the Real Presence, is founded on the doubts which the Holy Fathers propose regarding this mystery, as also on their mode of solving these doubts; let us hear Sts. Cyril, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysost, who in their instructions to the faithful, professedly propose them. Cyril, of Jerusalem, thus meets the doubts, in regard to the Eucharist, which may arise in the mind of Neophytes (newly baptized persons), whom he was instructing: "When Christ himself said of the bread '*This is my body*,' and of the chalice '*This is my blood*,' who will dare doubt. Water He formerly changed into wine, which has an affinity to blood, and we shall not deem him worthy of belief (*parum dignum cui credamus*), when he has changed wine into blood. Judge not the thing from *taste*, but from *faith*; what seems bread is not bread, what seems wine is not wine, though it may seem so to the taste, it is the flesh and blood of Christ." St. Ambrose in his Book de Initiatis (on the Initiated) c. ix., v. 48, uses the following words, in reference to the Eucharist: "Perhaps you will say, I see another thing, how sayest thou to me, I will receive the body of Christ; Moses held the rod, he threw it down, it was made a serpent. The word of Christ which from nothing could make what was not, can it not change those which are into that which they are not? but why use we

arguments, let us use Christ's example, by the mystery of the Incarnation let us prove (*adstruamus*), the truth of the Eucharistic mystery. Contrary to the order of nature a virgin conceived, and the body which we consecrate is of the virgin. Why here seek you the order of nature, when contrary to the order of nature he was born of a virgin? *The true flesh then of Christ, which was crucified and buried is in (the Eucharist) our L. J. C. proclaims aloud, "This is my body."*

St. Chrsostem. Hom. in Math. lxxxii., cap 10, speaks thus : "Let us believe God, and let us not resist him," although to our sense and thought may seem absurd what he saith. The words of Christ cannot deceive, our sense is most easy to be deceived. How many say, "I would wish to see his form, his raiment, his shoes." *Lo (in the Eucharist), you see Him, you touch, you eat Him !*" St. Ephreim, Bp. of Edessa, and who flourished A.D. 379, speaks thus of the Eucharist, c. 5 : "Why examinest thou into things not to be examined ; partake of the immaculate flesh of the Lord, likewise of His blood, with the most entire faith, certain you truly eat the Lamb himself. The mysteries of God are inscrutable, they are a fire, beware you do not rashly approach them, or examine them lest you be consumed in their blaze."

Could any catechism or manual of prayer in the Rom. Cath. Church, even at this present day, be found, in which the doctrine of the Real Presence is taught with more clearness, neatness and precision. When the Holy Fathers spoke concerning the Eucharist, they had no opportunity of indulging in hyperboles. for they either applied themselves to instil into the mind of the Church's children a knowledge of the pure and simple truths of faith, or they had for object to confirm in the faith, the learned and the illiterate, both alike. Sts. Cyril and Ambrose especially informed and enlightened Neophytes concerning the Eucharist, with the view they may worthily approach it. Then was not the time to give them "a stone for bread, a scorpion for a fish ;" they were not to be initiated in a knowledge of the sacred mysteries by mendacious instruction, which would render them idolators, and doom them forever to superstitious worship. The doubts they propose, their mode of solving them, prove to a certainty they believed the flesh and blood of Christ were present in the Eucharist.—Card. Perron.

3RD PROOF.

Demonstration—All the Holy Fathers admit consequences which could only apply to the Real Presence ; this is certain from what they deliberately aver : 1st. Concerning the effects of the Eucharist ; concerning the dispositions necessary to receive it ; regarding the heinousness of the sin they commit who receive it unworthily. As to the effects, the Holy Fathers tell us, by receiving the Eucharist, an intimate union with Christ is formed, not only, but they add, we become of the same body with him, of the same blood ; so much so, that of us it may be truly affirmed, we carry Christ in us. Thus, Cyril of Jerusalem speaks : "This would be a vain parade of words, a hyperbole truly, if the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist was but figurative, but most applic-

able if he believed in the Real Presence." Either in consecrating the Eucharist or in receiving it, the Fathers require the most excellent dispositions. Sts. Chrysost, Jerome, Augustin, extol the dignity of the priesthood, from the fact, "that they consecrate the body of Christ," that in their *hands* as in the *womb* of the Virgin, He becomes incarnate. From the simple faithful, they require not only a soul purified from every dross of sin, as all Christians should be, but they require in addition, when they approach the table of the Lord, "nothing must happen, even tortuously, which is not suitable to the dignity of so great a sacrament, 'for the least particle of the Eucharist' saith Cyril, 'is more precious than all gold, than all precious stones.'"

Now this could not be so if what the Sacramentarians allege be true. If the Presence of Christ were *figurative* only, a particle of the Eucharistic bread, a drop of the Eucharistic wine, could not be deemed more precious, of a greater value, than the water of baptism, which drops from the head of the infant, and flows into the sink.—De La Houge.

The Holy Fathers write, the body of Christ could be received by the just and wicked alike; the unworthy receiving of it they compare to the treason of Judas, to the crime of the Jews who crucified Christ; hence S. Cyprian, in his treatise, "*de lapsis*," i. e., "the fallen," thus inveighs against those who burned incense to idols, and not performing in full their course of public penance, feared not to sit at the sacred table, "almost vomiting the food of idols, they seize on the body of the Lord, violence is offered to the body and blood of the Lord, and with their hands and mouths they sin as much against God as when they denied God." Now, in the doctrine of a mere figurative presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist; according to which Christ is eaten only *through faith*, how could the "*lapsi*" (fallen off) be deemed sacriligious invaders inferior to apostates. The "*lapsi*," who, truly penitent and sorry for their sin, prematurely indeed, but out of a pious desire, approached the Eucharistic table, that with pure and simple faith they may receive Christ whom they owned for Redeemer. It is to be observed that in this public case of "the *lapsi*," Cyprian could aver nothing but what was in accordance with the belief of the whole Christian world.

4th. A Lemma. To the Eucharist, inasmuch as it contains the body and blood of Christ, could apply the following words (language) which the Fathers use in reference to it: 1st. That Christ, holding the Eucharistic bread in his hands, *carried himself*. S. August, Ps. 35, "That whilst Christ in heaven sitteth at the right hand of the Father, at the same time he is held in the hands of all who receive him," S. J. Chrysost. (lib. de Sacerdot.) "This one body, distributed among so many thousands of the faithful, is wholly received by each one, and remains entire and indivisible in itself." S. Greg of Nysa, Oratio ad Catechum, 33. Finally, all the Holy Fathers affirm "the Eucharist is to be adored."—Witasse Tourneley Bellarmine, auct. perpet. fid.

OBJECTIONS SOLVED.

Objections are adduced against the Real Presence from the meta-

phors which the Fathers often use in their discourses, especially in their sermons on baptism and alms deeds. They say, for example, "the baptismal waters are full of the Holy Ghost." They term baptism "the purple, the fringe, the vestment, the diadem of Christ;" they denominate it "the fountain of life, the guide, the chariot in which we are borne to heaven;" they add that it is tinged with the blood of Christ, with which we are therein sprinkled, that in it we put on Christ, and that we become "Christophori," *i. e.*, *bearers of Christ*. 2nd. The Holy Fathers use metaphors (figurative language) not less abstruse, when they encourage the faithful to give alms to the poor, whom they represent "*as the very person of Christ*," by visiting them, caring for them, feeding them, we care for, feed and clothe Christ himself," saith J. Chrysostom. He moreover adds, Hom. 89, "Christ himself, in the person of the poor, asks for alms, although we do not see him with our eyes." What more significative, more expressive, could be found in the writings of the Fathers regarding the Eucharist, and therefore what they write in reference to it, is to be understood in a metaphorical sense.

Answer.—No person ever believed "the waters of baptism were filled with the Holy Ghost, that baptism was the purple, the fringe, the raiment which Jesus Christ wore at the time of his passion, that he verily, and indeed with his body and blood, remained in a baptized person, or in a mendicant, whereas the whole Christian world down to the 16th cent. believed and professed the body and blood of Christ were contained in the Eucharist; wherefore, according to the judgment of all Christians, the sayings of the Fathers when they speak in reference to the Eucharist, are to be received in a far different sense from that in which their sayings are to be received, which relate to baptism and to the poor.

When the Fathers applied these metaphors, they never suspected from their discourse there could arise any doubt as to the manner the Holy Ghost would be present in the waters of baptism, or the way Christ was to be present in the person of the poor; they could not suspect the faithful would believe a Real Presence in either case, such doubts they never propose or attempt to solve; but they propose and solve them in regard to the Eucharist, from their sayings in respect to the Eucharist, they were entirely certain the faithful would understand a Real Presence—they confirm this sense. These sayings, then, cannot be compared with those uttered in regard to Baptism and the to poor.

Metaphors, when easy to be understood are not explained, and therefore are not proved by various arguments; so it is with the metaphorical expressions referring to baptism and to the person of the poor; but when metaphors are abstruse, easy wrested to an erroneous sense, they are to be explained, nor are they to be confirmed by repeated sayings which would suggest that erroneous sense, else the hearers would be led into an unavoidable error. We have seen above the Fathers confirmed again and again the sense of a Real Presence in the Eucharist, which the faithful inferred from their sayings, and therefore they were not metaphorical.—De La Houge, Dr. Sorb. Prof. Sac. Theol.

1st. It is false to assert the sayings of the Fathers with respect to the Eucharist could be compared with the metaphors they use respecting baptism; they have nowhere asserted the purifying waters of baptism were the Holy Ghost himself, the same purple garment which Christ wore at the time of his passion, whilst they proclaim aloud, in the Eucharist is contained and received the same body which was born of the virgin, which the Magi adored, which was nailed to a cross and laid in a sepulchre. The Holy Fathers have not said the waters of baptism, by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, have been changed into the blood of Christ, as they have asserted regarding the Eucharistic elements. 2nd. To compare the words of the Fathers when they speak of the rich and of the poor, soliciting alms, and when they speak of the Eucharist, is equally unreasonable, for if they speak of the poor sometimes as if they were the person of Christ; they often distinguish them from his person when they say it is possible the poor may be *hypocrites, liars and wicked*; of a rich man reduced to poverty they have not said he is become Christ by the fact, or that the Holy Ghost is to be invoked, to convert him into the person of Christ by taking his riches from him, which conversion they would endeavor to render propable by the miracle which shone forth at the creation of the world.—Author of the Perpetuity of Faith.

The objection is solved, which is derived from the different ways the Fathers speak of the Eucharist. The various sayings of the Fathers are to be reconciled—this cannot be accomplished unless we understand, in a metaphorical sense, those words which would seem to express a Real Presence, the use among them is common to style the Eucharist "figure," "type," "sign," "image of the body of Christ," they often say "Christ is absent from the earth," they hesitate not to aver "in the Eucharist is not eaten the body of Christ;" this being the case, either the Holy Fathers were not consistent with themselves, if they taught the Real Presence, and therefore no proof in favor of this dogma can be deduced from their words, or their words are to be explained in a metaphorical sense, which is easy done by admitting, by supposing they refer to the virtue, efficacy, and other inherent qualities of this Sacrament. The Sacramentarians lay much stress on these texts to counteract the force of the numerous texts from tradition, which are quoted against them by Catholics.

Answer.—In the mystery of the Eucharist, as it is taught in the Rom. Cath. Church, two things entirely different are to be considered—the one terrene, the other celestial—the thing celestial is the body of Christ, the terrene (earthly) are the forms of bread and wine. Now, according as the Eucharist is considered under that or the other respect, different modes of expression are required, one of which would indicate the outward species, the other the body of Christ. Some modes of expression, which would indicate both at the same time, the terms "*flesh, body, and blood*," betoken the real body and blood of Christ, abstracting entirely from the outward form or species, which are expressed by the words *bread and wine*, sometimes by the terms "sign," "figure,"

"symbol," "sacrament;" the two last appellations signify sometimes the *species*, sometimes the *body of Christ*; from this it follows in terms regarding the Eucharist, something may be affirmed of the species or outward form which would not apply to the body of Christ; something may be predicated of the body of Christ, which would not apply to the visible species; something in fine could be affirmed of both, which would not apply to either separately. A like use of different forms of expressions, relating to the same argument—the Mystery of the Incarnation—exhibits to us: Christ is said to be God, is said to be man, although the humanity can not be styled *God*, nor the divinity *man*, so with respect to the Eucharist, no confusion of ideas will arise in the mind of the faithful, who are well instructed, when they hear it denominated one time *bread* and *wine*; another time, the *body* and *blood* of Christ. "They," says S. Irenæus, "who hear from the mouth of their pastors words which denote the thing earthly, 'videlicet,' the visible species; words which denote the thing heavenly, viz: the body of Christ, hear the Eucharist so called without any confusion of mind."

Wherefore, when the Fathers term the Eucharist "figure," "image," "symbol," it would be unjust to suppose they meant to exclude its other properties, especially that under which it is the body of Christ, as the figure may be replete with the thing it represents, and the visible image may be united with the invisible thing which it figures; thus under the form of a dove the Holy Ghost descended on Christ, (Jon. 1, 52) under the veil (form) of a visible body, angels appeared to the Patriarchs.

The holy Fathers could say the flesh of Christ was eat, and was not eaten; they could say it was eat, with respect to the outward species, which are received into the mouth and stomach; that it was not eaten, inasmuch as it is not subject to the accidents of common food, which is digested and dissolved. They could say the body of Christ was eaten by the wicked, and was not eaten by them; that it was eat by them because they, no less than the just, really and truly receive Christ into their mouth; that his body was not received by them, because this sacred body does not produce in the wicked, the same salutary effects it doth in those who worthily receive it. They could say Christ was present on earth on account of his true presence in the Eucharist. They could say he was absent from earth, because his Real Presence is invisible. In like manner the body of Christ could be said to be spiritual, because it is not apprehended by the senses. It is to be observed, the forms of expression apparently contradictory, are especially used by those Fathers, who in the most eloquent terms teach the Real Presence by Ss. Cynil, Tevorne, J. Chrysostom; Bernard, whom Protestants have never commended for favoring their doctrine.—Dr. Milner. End of contro.

The objection is solved which Sacramentarians advance against the Real Presence, from the various uses to which the ancients applied it.

It was the custom among them, they say, on receiving the Eucharist, to touch their lips, eyes, and forehead with the consecrated species. To this ceremony Cyril encourages the Neophytes. They sometimes used

the Eucharist as a salve to heal sores, as S. August writes in *3rd bk. of unfinished work*. It was a custom among the ancients to deposit the Eucharist in the grave with the bodies of the faithful. In the life of S. Basil we read instances of this. The consecrated species of wine was sometimes mixed with ink when the condemnation of Heretics was signed. Thus was signed the condemnation of Photius at the 4th Gen. Coun. of Constant'ple, as Nicetas relates. Theophanes writes: the condemnation of Phyrus, who favored Monothelism, was signed in like manner; the remnants of the Eucharist were cast into the fire, which no person would dare do if they were believed to be the body of Christ. History bears testimony that in some churches the Eucharist would not be received on fast days for fear "of breaking the fast;" from which fact it is to be inferred they believed the bread and wine *still* remained in the Sacrament.

Answer.—Many of these uses confirm and not invalidate a belief in the Real Presence, something preternatural and extraordinary, with a firm faith they all must believe to lie hid in the blessed Sacrament, when, on most solemn occasions and rare, the consecrated elements were used either to heal bodies when alive, or protect them in the graves when dead, or in sanction of the condemnation of Heresiarchs, as if Christ himself were present in person. We do not read the water of baptism, sanctified as it is by prayer, to be ever so used on such solemn occasions. The fact of Cyril recommending to the faithful to touch their eyes, lips and forehead with the consecrated host, as also of the Bishops in Gen. Coun. of Constant. signing the condemnation of Photius, the schismatic; the fact of Theodore P. signing the condemnation of Pyrrhus Monothelit with ink mixed with the consecrated species of wine, arose from their belief in the Real Presence. To it is to be ascribed the strange use of the consecrated bread and wine, which is objected, and confirms this article of Catholic doctrine, although from piety *on their* part, no doubt, in such acts, something deordinate (irreverent), may certainly seem to us to have transpired who live at so great a distance of time.

The belief in the Real Presence is not invalidated by these other uses connected with the Eucharist, and are objected, e. g., "burning the remnants thereof," not receiving it on fast days. What is said relating to the remnants of the Eucharist being burned may be understood of those already decayed or beginning to decay; but if it so happened that remnants of the Eucharist not yet decayed were cast into the fire, this, though outrè (less opportune), according to modern discipline, arose from reverence towards the blessed Sacrament. In the Rubrics of the Rom. Missal we read the following prescription: "If any priest, immediately after receiving, should vomit the communion, and if it is not dissolved be it cast into the fire." As regards not receiving the Sacrament of the Eucharist on fast days, this custom is still observed in the Greek Church, "though its members believe and profess the Real Presence, they abstain from the Eucharist on fast days,

that they may be deprived of the nourishment which even the species afford."—De La Houge and Milner.

The objections deduced from the silence of the Pagans is solved. The Protestant Minister, Claud, thus proposes this objection: "If the Christians of the first ages believed in the dogma of the Real Presence, the Pagans would hear of it no doubt, and ridicule it, for the nature of the Eucharistic mystery is different from other mysteries; it is practical; the Christians were to celebrate it each day; its substance, then, could not be concealed from the Pagans." 2nd. A knowledge of this mystery, they could have from incautious Christians, from apostates, or even from those apologies which Doctors of the Church wrote to some Emperors. Undoubtedly it cannot be denied, Julian the Apostate, who was educated in the Church from his early youth, who was ordained "Reader," could completely know whatever belonged to the substance of this mystery. It is certain, then, according to Claud, the dogma of the Real Presence could not be in vogue among the primitive Christians, and the Pagans not to know it and deride it.

Answer.—All the principles of the objection are false. 1st. It is certain, few, if any, of the Pagans were acquainted with the Eucharistic dogma; no person could become so infatuated as to undertake concealing what he believed all knew. Now, it is certain from historic records worthy of all belief, the Doctors and Pastors of the Church down to 4th cent., and beyond it, left nothing untried, used every diligence, that Pagans may not hear or know aught of the Eucharistic mystery. Tertulian, of the 3rd cent., advises his wife, if she happened to become a widow, to abstain from a new marriage, especially with a heathen, "for fear," he says, "your husband may discover what you taste before all food," *i. e., the Eucharist*. Sts. Cyril, Ambrose, J. Crystost, Theoderet say many things enigmatical in their sermons on the Eucharist; the reason they assign is "for fear some uninitiated persons may intrude themselves into the congregation of the faithful." 2nd. This knowledge they could not have from spies sent stealthily into the meetings of Christians. The rigid discipline of silence, which then prevailed, would prevent it, and which was enforced so much that even the Catechumens (unbaptized) were not suffered to hear the sermons of the Fathers preached on the Eucharist, the initiated (the baptized) alone were privileged to hear them.

"The Catechumens themselves," saith S. August, "do not know what the baptized hear. What heathen, with no other motive to impel him, except a desire to learn what Christians believed concerning the Eucharist, would subject himself to the severe discipline of the Catechumenate; to its long laborious probation, which was two, three, yea, sometimes four years in duration. Who, among Pagans, would subject himself to the severe questioning, to the close enquiry which pastors made regarding their morals. Who of them would incur the danger of incarceration, of exile, nay of death, to all which Catechumens were no less liable than the Baptized, when persecution raged fierce. Heathens could not have a knowledge of this dogma from apostates, for the force

of torments, and not hatred of the Christian religion, or of its professors, urged them to abjure by word the faith which they believed at heart, and were resolved to return to it as soon as the persecution relented. This information we derive from the writings of Cyprian ("*de lapsis*"). Of such persons it may be safely affirmed, they would not be capable of betraying the secret of the church. 3rd. The apologies of Christians, which may be deemed of public note, were few. The apology written in the 2nd Cent., by S. Justin, and inscribed by him to Antoninus, Emperor, was not perhaps read by this potentate, or by few others, so much did they slight and despise the Christian religion. 2nd. Even had they known concerning the Real Presence, their silence could be accounted for; thus they observed silence respecting the mysteries of the Trinity, incarnation, and original sin, which they might easily know; and from the apparent repugnance of which they could retort much on the objections advanced by Christians against their plurality of gods, and their various generations. Of this oversight (neglect) on the part of the Heathens, more than one reason can be assigned.

1st. They entertained so great contempt for Christians, that they spurned enquiring into their doctrine. 2nd. To refute this doctrine, they deemed *punishment* much more convincing than *argument*. 3rd. Here we are to admire the ways of providence; God, who reigns over the minds of men, will not sometimes permit them to do and to say what, under the circumstances, may be expected from them to do, and to say; even Julian the Apostate, who was well acquainted with the mysteries of the Christian religion, makes no objection against them, he only attempts turning them into ridicule.—De La Houge, De Sorb."

It is not certain the pagans who could really know aught of the Christian religion (Eucharistic mystery), did actually observe silence regarding it, thus Celsus, philosopher, wrote 3 books against the Christian faith, and *one* book of his we only know: The One Origin Refuted. In like manner of the 3 books composed by Julian, only one remains, and it not entire; it was refuted by Cyril of Alexandria. Now in the books of Celsus and Julian, which are lost, perhaps some mention of the Eucharist may have been made, to it might refer the following false allegation of the Gentiles against the Christians, viz.: "*That they licked up the blood and eagerly devoured the flesh of an infant whom they slew, sprinkling Him with flour.*" This calumny was spoken against them by Cecilius the philosopher; as Minutius Felix writes, here "the true" and "false" are mixed up. As is the case in what is known from a confused report, now we catholics thus proceed to found an argument on this false charge alleged by the Gentiles, to show the primitive Christians believed in the Real Presence, e. g. For if in the Eucharist they believed there was but a figure or sign of the body of Christ, why, by a simple declaration of their faith did they not disprove the horrid calumny? The crime of killing an infant and eating his flesh, as they were accused of doing, and for this suffer the most excruciating torment, they indeed may be well adjudged insane, and not to come forward with a declaration of the figurative presence, if they were of the protestant

persuasion, but if as catholics they believed in the Real Presence, they were worthy of all praise, for suffering even death rather than betray the secret of the church.—Auctor per petuit fidei.

3RD ARGUMENT.

THE DOGMA OF THE REAL PRESENCE PROVED FROM PROSCRIPTION.

Proscription is derived from jurisprudence, and signifies the right arising from the possession of anything, which possession has certain conditions annexed, and is continued the whole time ; prescribed by law, which alone suffices to invalidate every claim, to baffle every hope of the litigant, who would claim a thing as his own. The argument of prescription is twofold, *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* : "I possess whatever I hold in possession, you have no right to contend with me for it." Lo, a specimen of extrinsic prescription ! "I possess a thing, and it is impossible I would hold possession of it had I not a right thereto, therefore I hold lawful possession. Lo, a specimen of intrinsic prescription. The cause of proposing the argument of prescription was this ; Aubertin Calvinist compiled a work from the Fathers, which he affirmed expressed a figurative sense of Christ's presence. Our Rom. Cath. controvertists thought they could subvert all he said by way of proof, with prescription ; for according to them, there existed a time in which for certain the whole Christian world believed and held the doctrine of the Real Presence, "to wit," the time of Berengare, in the 11th Cent. Heretics and Sysmatics professed it at the same epoch, and this consent could not exist unless it were the belief of all past ages, up to the time of the Apostles ; so then, setting all examination aside into the texts of the Fathers quoted, Catholics justly conclude they are not opposed to the Real Presence.—Nicolius, Dr.

1st. There was an epoch in which the whole world held the doctrine of the Real Presence. 2nd. It is impossible that in any age preceding this epoch a change of Doctrine would takeplace ; both these assertions will be proved beyond a doubt. The first is thus proved, viz. : In the time of Berengarius, in the 11th Cent., the whole Christian world believed in the Real Presence ; this, no person will deny, when we remember the universal reclamation against Berengare, who taught the contrary, the arguments advanced against him, and Berengare's own reply. Scarce did he disseminate his doctrine, when in a very short space of time, 15 Councils were convened, all which condemned his doctrine ; one of these, held in Rome, at which assisted 103 Bishops, denounced him as an innovator, he was opposed by eminent men of every order, whilst he had scarce a single patron of any note. Berengare was proscribed, on account of the novelty of his doctrine, "by which," it was alleged, "he departed from Catholic unity, and scandalized the whole Church." So Adelman, his contemporary, reproached him ; so Heugh, of Lingon, and Lanfranc Abp, of Canterbury, who rebukes him in the following style : "If what you believe and write be true (concerning the body of Christ), what has been written and believed by the church of every nation, must needs be false ; ask all

who speak the Latin tongue, ask the Greeks and Armenians, question the Christians of every country, and with one accord they will bear testimony, this (the Real Presence), to be their belief." What is Berengarius reply to this great array of testimony ; to it he opposes the obscure book of Scotus, he quotes some mutilated texts of the Fathers. Finally, after the manner of all innovators, he presumes to say the whole Church hath erred, thus betraying the newness of his doctrine. Certain, then is it, all the churches of the world, schismatical and heretical, believed in the Real Presence, and professed it.—Nicolius.

2nd. It will now be shown, that at no epoch from Berengarius' time back to the time of the Apostles, a change could take place in this article of faith, for this change would have occurred, either by a sudden departure of all churches from the ancient faith, or gradually, and by slow steps it would have crept in, first into one church then into another ; but to suppose a sudden falling away of the church from the ancient belief, is too absurd to require refutation, for who of a sane mind would say, the Church on this day slept firmly believing in a figurative presence of Christ, and awoke on the following day believing and professing His Real Presence in the sacrament. The change of doctrine which would gradually creep in, is not less repugnant ; for this is to be observed regarding the Eucharist, "to wit," that it is not a speculative mystery, as are the Trinity and Incarnation ; with it is connected something practical, inasmuch as it is every day consecrated by priests, and received by the faithful, who were necessarily to be informed, of the dispositions required for worthily receiving it, wherefore, the pastors, by their incessant preaching, must needs explain to the faithful the substance of this doctrine, viz. : the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament. If at this time the pastors inculcated a belief of the figurative presence only, it is repugnant to think Christians would afterwards believe such an image would be the real body of Christ, without being sensible of any change in their faith.

Whenever any new doctrine was attempted to be introduced into the church, immediately there ensued controversies and contentions, great trouble spread among the laity, and this concerning dogmas, which by their metaphysical sublimity surpassed their comprehension. This is recorded to have been the case in questions concerning the consubstantiality of the word, the divinity and procession of the Holy Ghost ; and, in a case having more affinity with the one we are discussing, namely, the question of images, which in the 8th Century agitated the church ; who can imagine an epoch in which all bishops, priests and laity were conscious of this change the sacramentarians allege to have taken place in the Eucharist, and all to observe a profound silence, respecting it. When Berengarius—in place of the doctrine of the Real Presence, which in his time was the doctrine of the whole church—attempted to foist in the doctrine of a figurative presence, the whole Christian world was put in commotion, whence it is easy to understand, if in times past any innovation was attempted in the dogma of the Eucharist, if for the *figurative presence*, which Protestants aver to be the belief of the

church in the beginning, it were attempted to substitute a Real Presence, and which they deem repugnant to reason, in such a hypothesis; what a reclamation would ensue; yes, and authentic monuments of this reclamation would reach us, as do those reach us which refer to other heterodox doctrine attempted to be disseminated. So then, by the argument of prescription it is proved, the belief in the Real Presence, which was general in the time of Berengare, was the belief of all passed ages back to the time of the Apostles. In the proof it is admitted as an indubitable fact, the Greeks believe in the Real Presence no less than the Latins, no doubt must be allowed to exist as to the Greeks believing in the Real Presence. It is absolutely certain, no difference seems ever to exist among them and the Roman Catholics respecting this article.—Author of Perpetuit of faith.

Protestant controvertists make objections against the argument of prescription in proof of the Real Presence; they allege, many things at various times in the Church have been received, charged and abolished; nor was there a reclamation, e. g., public penance in all its grades, the use of unleavened bread among the Latins, communion under one form, the manner of conferring baptism, by infusion and not by immersion. So also they insist a like change might take place in the Eucharist, and people not advert to it, or not to reclaim.

Answer.—Many things at various times have been received, changed and abolished, but they all relate to discipline, and not to dogma, or articles of faith. It has never been controverted, whether without reclamation may be introduced some pious usages indifferent in themselves, which, when proposed by the pastors of the Church (whose authority in determining such things the faithful deem supreme), are received without contradiction; the same is to be said of rites pertaining to the administration of the sacraments, and affect not their substance. From this it follows only, by the argument of prescription it cannot be proved this or that discipline existed, unless it be essentially connected with some dogma, as *they* are which relate to the Hierarchy; but the force of the argument derived from prescription is not weakened thereby, i. e., the one in proof of the Real Presence, because it depends for strength on this evident principle: it is not to be supposed possible a certain false doctrine could be proposed in the church, which when once admitted true faith and the true meaning of scripture would entirely perish, and this (false doctrine) to be received without a reclamation throughout the Christian world, all pastors, all the faithful, conniving and concurring thereat. If this principle would seem doubtful, all moral certitude would cease to exist, would vanish.—Nicolius.

An objection is urged against prescription in proof of the Real Presence from the fact of Paschasius Rhadbertus, who flourished in the 9th Cent.

Paschasius, Abbot of Corbey in Saxony, wrote a book A.D. 830, on the truth of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, *and it is beyond all doubt*, writes Claud, Protestant minister, his doctrine was impugned, not privately by some obscure authors, but publicly, and by authors of distinguished and great name, by Rhabanus, Maurus, Bp. of

Moguntum, by Bertrammus, Abbot of Corbey, and next successor of Radbert, and by other eminent men, whose authentic works are still to be found. We have on record then an instance of reclamation against the Real Presence, and therefore the argument derived from prescription in its favour proves void, of no effect.

Answer.—From this fact, whatever it be the argument of prescription is not invalidated, no symptoms of a reclamation is detected against the work of Paschase, such as it should be if he promulgated a new doctrine regarding the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, such as substituting a Real for a Figurative Presence, which down to his time was believed, as from historic monuments may be proved. It is well known no innovation was ever attempted with respect to any dogma, that the whole Church would not be in commotion, decrees would be issued by Popes, definitions passed by Bishops, both assembled and dispersed, publishing anathemas 'gainst the new doctrine, and denouncing its author. Instances of such reclamation we discover long after Radbert, against Berengare, denouncing his new-fangled doctrine of a figurative presence of Christ's body and blood. A reclamation no less solemn would take place against Radbert, if, in his book, he departed (deviated) from the ancient and hitherto existing faith of a figurative presence, by teaching it was true and real; no symptoms of such a reclamation can be traced on record. Some obscure works of Theologians are quoted, in which the book of Paschasius is attacked, his name not being mentioned. It may be inferred, then, the controversy 'twixt Radbert and his adversaries was not concerning the substance of the dogma, but about some accessory questions thereof.—Bossuet, Book 4, variations.

It can be shown by many arguments, the doctrine was not new which represents the body of Christ to be really and truly present in the Eucharist, and which Paschase propounded in his work and taught, for he expressly affirms the Real Presence was the belief of all, "*fides totius mundi*." In his letter to Fredigard Abbot he writes: "Let him who will contradict this (the Real Presence) see, let him consider what he does against the Lord himself and the whole world, and what all unanimously assert to be true;" so to speak in reference to a new doctrine, would be bold, indiscreet and reckless, should not the Church profess the same, and at all times profess it. Of all who, in their letters, attacked Paschasius, not one accused him of making any innovation in doctrine, because of his teaching the Real Presence, not any threatens to cite him before his ecclesiastical judges, as if he aimed at subverting the old faith, and when in that supposition, they should denounce him to all the faithful "to beware of the false teacher;" they do not, in their writings against him, even mention his name.

The controversy, then, turned on some other point; at this time many questions were discussed regarding the Eucharist, which did not belong to its substance, but were mere accessories. 1st. It was enquired, if, in the Eucharist, we precisely have the same body which was born of the virgin Mary, which was affixed to the cross; this, in his work, Paschasius affirmed, but the whole controversy proved to be a

logomachy, *i. e.*, a contention about words, for the adversaries of Paschase did not deny what he asserted, except that the body of Christ in the Eucharist was not the same as it was in the womb of the virgin and on the cross, in appearance, form, manner of existing, size, quantity, circumscription. No wonder if in an age in which these consequences of the Real Presence were not yet elucidated, such questions would arise, although all may be unanimous in their belief of the Real Presence.—Tourneley, in Major Prelect.

3rd. It was enquired whether the body of Christ lay hid under some figure in the Eucharist, or some veil, whether that which is seen, touched, broken and masticated, is the very body of the Lord; indeed, it can scarce be believed, there were some who thought there was neither sign, figure or veil in the Eucharist, and that all which falls under our senses is the body of Christ himself, which is touched, broken and masticated. It cannot be dissembled; but this was argued with much warmth in the 9th, 10th and 11th cents., without the disputants understanding each other, as is often the case in the heat of discussion, when the subject of debate is beyond the reach of human comprehension (understanding). Radbert, for certain, admitted the real body of Christ lay hid under a veil or sign; his adversaries, by saying there existed a figure in the Eucharist, acknowledged it was no empty figure, but one full of reality. The reason they insisted so much on the term "figure," was that the *reality* of the body of Christ in the Sacrament, was not manifest conspicuous visible to the human eye, to this the whole question resolved itself.—Tourneley, in Prelect.

CHAPTER 2nd.

ON THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE EUCHARIST.

Sacrifice, in its most general sense, is defined to be anything which is intended for the honour and glory of God, be it internal and spiritual, external or corporal. In this sense, all acts of faith, prayers, voluntary afflictions of body, fasts, &c., in a word, any act of mind or body referred to the honour and glory of God, may assume the name of "Sacrifice." This information we derive from the following passages of Scripture: "Immolate to God an host of praise," Ps. 40; "An afflicted spirit is a sacrifice to God," Ps. 50; "whoever doth mercy, offers sacrifice," Eccles. 35, "I beseech you, brethren, you exhibit your bodies a living, pleasing host to God," Rom. 12. Sacrifice, in the proper sense of the word, is defined "an external oblation of a visible thing made to God alone, by a lawful minister, to acknowledge his supreme dominion over us, and our dependance on him." Ever since the beginning of the world to offer sacrifice is deemed a necessary duty of man, and an essential part of religion; hence we read in Genesis 4, "Cain offered to God of the first fruits of the earth;" "Abel also offered of the firstlings of his flock, and of their fat;" of Noe it is written, Gen. 28, "he built an altar to the Lord, and taking of all the clean beasts and birds, he offered holocausts on this altar." Soon after the flood we read of the sacrifices of Abraham and posterity; Abraham

"built altars (for sacrifice) in Sichem, and near the valley of Mambre," (Gen. 12); "Isaac in Bershabé," Jacob near the Town of Salem, (26), and in Bethel (33); no victim more truly prefigured the Saviour in the flesh than Isaac, or more perfectly represented the sacrifice offered by him, as we behold *him*, "the heir of the promises carry on his back the burthen of wood on which he was to be laid, to be offered for a holocaust," if God did not prevent the act, (Gen. 22). Among the Patriarchs who offered sacrifice is to be remembered Melchisadech, "Priest of the most high God," (Gen. 14), who offered bread and wine *for a true sacrifice*. Christ, our Redeemer, by one offering on the cross accomplished them all, to apply its fruit to our soul he instituted the sacrifice of the Mass.

Christ, on the altar of the cross, offered a true sacrifice on this article as on a hinge, turns the whole economy of the Christian religion, for be this sacrifice abolished, and we abolish all need of the incarnation; no way of truly worshipping God is left, no means of repairing fallen nature, even the authority of Scripture becomes of no avail. Scripture, which teaches Christ to be a true priest, "and delivered himself for us to God, an oblation and victim for an odor of sweetness," (Ephes. 5). This sacrifice is essentially one all Christians acknowledge, "by one oblation he perfected for ever those to be sanctified;" but Catholics profess this same sacrifice is renewed in the Eucharist, so that it hath the nature of a true and perfect sacrifice, as is affirmed by the Fathers of the Council of Trent.—De La Houge, Dr.

THE EUCHARIST IS A TRUE AND PERFECT SACRIFICE.

THE EUCHARIST IS PROVED TO BE A SACRIFICE FROM SCRIPTURE TRADITION AND THEOLOGIC REASONING.

THE ARGUMENT FOUNDED ON SCRIPTURE.

Demonstration.—The oracles of the prophets announce, the sacrifices of the old law were to be abrogated, and that a new sacrifice, far surpassing them in value, was to be substituted; thus Isaias represents God to us addressing the following words to the Jews, chapt. 1: "Your Sabbath and your festivities I will not endure;" he expressly declares, c. 19, "at a future time there will be an altar of the Lord in the land of Egypt, whose people will worship him in victims and offerings." Jeremias, c. 38, foretells, "Priests and Levites will not die, who are to offer sacrifice, who are to burn incense and kill victims all days," so that they were to be as lasting, as perpetual "as the son of David, who was to reign on his throne." All interpreters explain the last words to relate to Christ; but in terms more clear than any of the Prophets, Malachias prophesies concerning the Eucharist, in the following words: "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, and a gift I will not receive from your hands, for from the rising of the sun to the setting of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place a clean oblation is sacrificed and offered to my name, for my name is great among the Gentiles," Mal. c. 1.

From this oracle, which was pronounced when now the second temple was built, we are left to infer three things: 1st. That all the sacrifices of the old law were to be abolished. 2nd. That a new sacrifice far more excellent, was to be substituted, for the words *sacrificatur et offertur* spoken in the present tense, are evidently used for the future tense, "*sacrificabitur et offeretur*," as is usual with prophets to do, who often seem to contemplate the things they foretell, as if they were transpiring before them; that sacrifice was to be offered *in every place* "from the rising to the setting sun." Now, what is predicated of this sacrifice could not apply to the sacrifice of the cross, for the sacrifice of the cross was offered but in one place in "Jerusalem;" nor could it be understood of the sacrifice of good works, good works could not be called a new sacrifice; such a sacrifice existed from the beginning of the world amongst the Patriarchs, and was continued among the Jews, "of whom many were tried by the testimony of faith," Heb. 11. Malachy, then, foretold the sacrifice of the Eucharist. It is thus Ss. Justin, Irenaeus, J. Chrysost, Jerome, August, understood the text and expounded it.—Bel'armine.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE EUCHARIST PROVED FROM THE PRIESTHOOD OF
MELCHISADECH.

Demonstration.—In Ps. 109. entirely prophetic of the Messiah, these words occur, which must refer to him: "The Lord swore and it will not repent him, *thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisadech.*" Here God speaks of a new priesthood, in which the Messiah himself was to be inaugurated, that he may be substituted for all the Aaronic priests, that he may remain high priest for ever, to offer him sacrifice; therefore Melchisadech, "*Priest of the most high*," as he is called in Genes. 14, and in Heb. 7, was a figure of Christ as priest, who must needs offer the sacrifice, which 1500 years after the time of Melchisadech, Malachy announced; the figure then, which, with the solemnity of an oath, God applies to the Messiah, should be obvious, conspicuous, and characteristic. This figure cannot exist, is not to be found, unless in the person of Melchisadech, or in some act of his. The figure does not apply to his person, for Aaron, as a person whose priesthood lasted for many ages among his sons, is a figure more obvious, more conspicuous, more characteristic of Christ as priest, than is the person of Melchisadech, whose priesthood was transitory, and not transmitted to his posterity; as also because the order according to which a priest sacrifices is not derived from his person, but from the rite (peculiar mode) of offering. Not, then, in the person of Melchisadech, but in some act of his, is this obvious, conspicuous and characteristic figure to be sought; two acts are mentioned in Scripture which relate to Melchisadech, (Gen. 14): 1st. "That he produced bread and wine;" 2nd. That "he blessed Abraham;" but "to bless" is not peculiar to, is not characteristic of a priest; "to bless" was an act performed by kings and fathers of families, not, then, "in blessing" is found the excellent and distinctive figure of Christ's priesthood; it is

necessarily to be sought for in the act of *producing*, i. e., offering bread and wine. Now, there is no act of Christ's in which this figure could be fulfilled, except in the Act of offering the Eucharist under the elements of bread and wine, the matter Melchisadech used in offering his own sacrifice, and therefore, in that act, the figure was fulfilled, as in the following words the fathers of the Council of Trent informs us : "Declaring his priesthood according to the order of Melchisadech, he offered his body and blood under the species of bread and wine to his Heavenly Father, and under the symbols of the same things gave it to his Apostles to take, whom he constituted priests of the New Testament, and ordered them and their successors, in these words to offer it : *"This do in commemoration of me."* This is an abbreviation of the argument, which most of the Holy Fathers derive from the sacrifice of Melchisadech, to prove the Eucharist to be a true and perfect sacrifice. —Estius in Epist. ad. Heb.

The holy Eucharist proved to be a sacrifice from the words of Christ and from the words of the Apostle Paul, concerning its use. Demonstration.—1st. To the words of Christ "*this is my body*," as they occur in Matthew and Mark, Luke adds, "*which is given for you*," c. xxii. ; and the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. c. xi., "*which will be delivered for you* ;" so too these words of Christ, respecting the chalice : "*this is my blood*," Matthew subjoins, c. xxvi., "*which is shed for you to the remission of sins*." In St. Luke the text reads thus : "*this chalice (is) the New Testament in my blood which will be shed for you*," which is shed for you according to the Greek word, "Ekchunomenon.

On these words this argument is founded ; at the last supper "the body of Christ," according to St. Luke, "*was given* ;" according to the Apostle, "*was broken* ;" likewise, "*His blood*," or the chalice of *His blood was shed to the remission of sins*." Christ therefore offered a true and perfect sacrifice, and whereas he commanded the same to be offered by the Apostles, and by their successors ; he consequently instituted the *sacrifice* of the *Eucharist*.

This explanation, in a wonderful manner, the Apostle confirms (1 Cor. x.) where he uses the following words in relation to the Eucharist : "the chalice of benediction which we bless is it not the communication of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break, is it not the participation of the body of Christ ;" here the Apostle wishes to interdict the Corinthians eating of the food consecrated to idols ; the whole scope of his argument presupposes a true sacrifice is offered in the Eucharist, in which the faithful share by receiving it. This is manifest from the similitude he uses, v. xviii. : "See Israel according to the flesh, are not they who partake of the sacrifice partakers of the altar." In the same chapter (20, 21), he adds, "what the nations sacrifice they sacrifice to demons, and not to God. You cannot drink of the chalice of the Lord and of the chalice of demons, you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord and the table of demons."

Here, manifestly the Apostle speaks of food offered in sacrifice, and immediately assimilates the chalice of the Lord and the participation of

His table to the chalice of demons, and to the participation of their table; now the chalice of Dæmons contained liquor offered in sacrifice, their table was furnished with food immolated to idols, they who sat at this table partook of the sacrifice; so also in the mind of the Apostle the chalice of the Lord, which the faithful drink, contains the blood of Christ truly offered on the altar, to be partakers of the Eucharistic table (altar) is partaking of the flesh of Christ, truly immolated thereon. 3rd. This the Apostle announces in terms, as these words show: "We have an altar, of which they have not the right to eat, who serve the tabernacle," where there is an altar there must needs be a *victim*. Christians have no altar but the Eucharistic altar, and therefore the victim immolated on it cannot be any other, unless the flesh and blood of Christ truly present.

2ND ARGUMENT.

THE EUCHARIST IS A SACRIFICE PROVED FROM TRADITION.

Demonstration.—The Holy Fathers everywhere designate the Eucharist by the appellations, Host, Victim, Sacrifice, Immolation. It is thus Sts. Justin, Irenæus, Ambrose, Cyril, August., term it; St. August. makes use of the following words in reference to his deceased mother: "Inspire O Lord thy servants, that as many as read these words at Thy altar may remember Thy servant Monica, together with her husband Patricius;" here, as well as prayers for the dead is manifestly announced, the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. This is inferred from the word altar there mentioned, and from the word victim which is said to be dispensed thereon: his words cannot refer to the Eucharistic *sacrament*, as it availeth not for the dead; the Holy Fathers require altars for celebrating the Eucharist, but altars refer direct to the offering of sacrifice. "What is more sacriligious for you Donatists," quoth Optatus, "than to break the altars of God, on which you once offered." The Holy Fathers denominate the ministers who celebrate the Eucharist, *sacerdotes* (sacrificing priests), and not *presbyteros* (elders). They tell us they sacrifice for the Emperor, for the Bishops, for the Church, for the whole world. Such words occur in the writings of Tertulian, Cyril, J. Chrysostom. The constant belief of Christians in the Eucharistic sacrifice, from the earliest time, all the liturgies both of the Greek and Latin rites, attest. Of these liturgies, some are so ancient as to be ascribed to the Apostles, some to Sts. Basil, Cyril, Ambrose. What is published in them as being offered by the minister, is designated by the terms, *oblation*, *victim*; a sacrifice like to that which Melchisadech offered, like to that which Abraham prepared himself to offer. By the argument derived from the liturgies, Protestants are much pressed; they never compiled such liturgies themselves, these ancient liturgies they would not repudiate. If they could be reconciled with their doctrine, which is this, "that in the Eucharist is no oblation, that it is merely in commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the cross."—De La Houge, Dr., Prof. S. Th.

3RD. ARGUMENT FROM THEOLOGICAL REASONING.

From the consent of all Christians, down to the Reformation of Luther, the Eucharistic sacrifice is proved. Demonstration.—The dogma of the Eucharistic sacrifice is not speculative, but practical, inasmuch as it was celebrated every day by priests on the altar, and with prayers, every word of which betokened the immolation of a victim; the significance of these prayers the simple faithful could easily understand. Certainly it could not be unknown to those who performed the Eucharist; whence it is easy to see, no change could creep in that a reclamation quite observable would not ensue; yet no trace of a reclamation against the Eucharistic sacrifice has been discovered, from the time of the Apostles to the Reformers of the 16th Cent.

We are to admit the Eucharistic sacrifice, or we are to believe no sacrifice is offered in the new law, which can not be reconciled with the state of true religion, for from the time of Adam the rite of sacrificing existed; Abel, Noe, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, offered sacrifice, as did Job and Melchisadech among the Gentiles, several kinds of sacrifice were prescribed by the law of Moses. The heathens offered sacrifice, if not from a natural impulse, at least from some faint glimmering light of primeval tradition. Now the same necessity which existed in the old law exists in the new law, of admitting this external bond of religion, to acknowledge God's supreme dominion, to thank him for his favours, or to obtain daily succour; there must then be some sacrifice in Christianity, which cannot be any other except the Eucharist.

The objections are solved which are adduced against the proof derived from the priesthood of Melchisadech.

It is argued, there is no reason for believing Melchisadech offered a true sacrifice, in the bread and wine which he produced in the presence of Abraham. This bread and wine could be aptly understood of provisions, with which he might supply Abraham and his companions returning from the fight; nor is this comment far fetched, nor anyway affected by the clause affixed: "for he was priest of the Most High," since in the Hebrew is not read the *causal* "for," but the *copulative* "and." Granting Melchisadech offered some sacrifice, in this act there is no figure of Christ as priest; for St. Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews, explaining at large what was in Melchisadech figurative of the Messiah, in order to apply it to Christ, nevertheless, speaks not one word of the oblation in bread and wine offered by him, with a view of applying it as a figure to Christ, instituting the Eucharist; in both acts; then there is no relation 'twixt type and archetype, *i.e.* 'twixt the figure and reality which perfects it.

Answer.—When Melchisadech produced bread and wine, it was not with the intention to supply with provisions Abraham and his companions, being well aware they returned from battle, loaded with those spoils which the vanquished kings seized from the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, to wit: "All the substance of the country, and everything which pertained to food" (Gen. xix., 11); they could not then stand in need of any provisions. The argument derived from the Hebrew read-

ing of the text, which uses "and" for which the vulgate translates "for," is of no weight or importance, 1st, for in many texts of scripture it is well ascertained, the conjunction "and," which is generally copulative, has often the signification of the causal "*for*." Howsoever the text is read, whether we say, "*and he was*," or "*for he was* priest of the most high," this proposition is not to be deemed incidental or accessory in the mind of the inspired Apostle; but is to be regarded the chief, the leading clause of the whole narration, for why make mention of the priesthood of Melchisadech, unless that 900 years after his act of sacrificing, David was to announce the Messiah, constituted by God, priest according to his order.

2nd. As to the silence of the Apost. Paul, when writing to the Hebrews, he explains the figure which lay hid in the person of Melchisadech. His silence with regard to the offering of bread and wine, made by him, can be accounted for from the fact, that it did not come within his scope (object), to speak regarding it; his object was to prove the priesthood of Christ far surpassed the Aaronic priesthood, to accomplish which it sufficed to show, Melchisadech, in whose order Christ was inaugurated priest by his heavenly father, was more eminent, far excelled all Aaronic ministers, both as to dignity and perennity of priesthood, this he shows: 1st, As to dignity, because Melchisadech blessed Abraham and received tithes from him, whence he says, "and Levi paid tithes through Abraham." 2nd. In perennity or duration he shows the order of Melchisadech to be superior to the order of Aaron, because, "Melchisadech, without father, mother, genealogy, having neither beginning of life nor end, but assimilated to the Son of God, remains priest for ever," (Ibidem, v. 3). Now neither the dignity nor the perennity of Christ's priesthood, could be commended from the substance of the sacrifice which Melchisadech offered in bread and wine, not the perpetuity, as that sacrifice was offered in an instant; nor was it ever repeated, nor the dignity. For the *matter* of the sacrifices of the old law, consisting of animals, first fruits, and loaves of proposition, which were renewed every Sabbath, was not of less value in itself, than the bare elements of bread and wine. Note.—As to the person of Melchisadech. It is ascertained he was a man, king of Salem, which was a city of the land of Canaan, and the opinion is to be ignored which makes him the eldest of the sons of Noah, when he is represented to be without father, mother or genealogy, having neither beginning or end of life, the Apostle by these words implies just, in scripture there is no mention of his parentage, birth or death, that by reason of some mystery they were overlooked, thereby to afford the Apostle an occasion of proving the perennity of Christ's priesthood, by a mystic exposition revealed to himself. Estius in cap. vii., Epist. ad Hebr.)

3rd. It is urged, as an objection against the sacrifice of the Eucharist; the Apost. Paul (Heb. x.), proves the sacrifices of the old law "to be weak and beggarly elements," because of the necessity of renewing them. In like manner the sacrifice of the cross should be deemed insufficient if it were daily to be renewed in the Eucharist; this objection is easily

solved by Catholics ; the sacrifice of the cross is renewed every day, not to increase the treasure of Christ's merits, but to apply them. The sacrifice of the cross is renewed, not as if it were incomplete in its nature, as if it were of limited value, as were the sacrifices of the old law. It is rather continued every day, as a thing most perfect and necessary, not to enhance the price of our redemption, but that to our souls it may app'y.—Bossuet, B, Maux.

Some questions relating to the sacrifice are solved. Does the consecration of both species belong to the sacrifice, *as to essence*? 1st. All are of opinion the consecration of either species could not be omitted without a great sin, under any pretext whatsoever. 2nd. With the exception of a few theologians, all maintain "the consecration of both species is enjoined, not only by ecclesiastical precept, but also by divine precept," which doctrine is to be likewise inferred from the following words of the Fathers of Trent (Sess. ii., c. 1): "Christ offered his body and blood under the forms of bread and wine, and under the same symbols commanded the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood to offer them." 3rd. Theologians are divided in opinion, with regard to the second question, viz., whether the sacrifice could be offered in one species, if not *licitly*, at least *validly*; the negative opinion is far more common; S. Thomas Aquinas holds it, and also Benedict xiv., p., in his work "On the Sacrifice." Benedict, in maintaining his opinion, depends chiefly on this principle—"that without both species, the immolation of Christ on the cross could not be truly represented." How a person could arrive at any other conclusion, is indeed difficult to comprehend, when we remember Christ, our Lord, instituted this august sacrifice in both species, and commanded his Apostles, "this do in commemoration of me," *i.e.* offer the *same* sacrifice. It is truly the doctrine of the Redeemer, written in his book of the gospel, and S. Paul avers (Galat. i., 8), "though we, or an angel from heaven, would preach a gospel different from that we have preached, let him be anathema."

Collet, with a few, would seem to be of a contrary opinion, as he gives clearly to understand, "in his greater prælections," there he intimates a dispensation from the precept of consecrating in both kinds may be granted by either the Pope, or a General Council. The way he maintains his opinion is ludicrous, truly, is absurd; rather reminding one of the vain imaginings of a dotard, delirious with age, than of the solid reasoning of a learned divine. 1st. He admits the precept of consecrating in both kinds, has God for author, notwithstanding "that a dispensation may be granted by the Pope! 2nd. He does not think such a dispensation was ever granted by the Pope or Church!! 3rd. He is in a doubt if the Church has such a power!!! (this he actually undertook to prove.) 4th. If she has, she will never exercise it, because of the possession of such power she should be as sure as one would be of a geometric problem. 5th. The arguments in favor of it do not exceed the limits of a mere probability—nay, are not approved by the greater number of theologians (not by one in a hundred). In the melodies of

Moore, often more delicate and elegant than chaste or pious, we read the following verses :

"Come, send round the wine,
Leave points of belief to simpleton sages and reasoning fools."

O Collet, well dost thou merit for thyself the rank and title of such personages as this voluptuous lyrist contemns and ridicules ! Among them you must surely graduate, and to *reason* so preposterous ; yea, or to thee well apply the words of the unenlightened proud Festus to Paul (Acts xxvi., 26) : "*Insanis, O Paule, et multæ litteræ, te ad insaniam convertunt.*" Thou ravest, O Collet, and the exuberance of thy learning has driven thee to utter nonsense, to speak drivelling silliness.—De La Houge, Jn. Sorb., Prof. S. Th.

Does the Sacrifice of the Eucharist differ from the Sacrifice of the Cross and Last Supper ? 1st. Not essentially, when in both cases the Victim is the same and the principal Offerer is the same, but it differeth accidentally from both ; for at the Last Supper Christ offered himself as mortal, and the oblation was meritorious. In the Eucharist he offereth himself through vicarial priests, and as immortal, who therefore can no longer merit, but apply to us the merits already acquired. It also differs in significance, for the Sacrifice of the Last Supper represented the death of Christ *as yet to come* ; but the Eucharistic Sacrifice commemorates it as a thing already *passed*. The Sacrifice of the Eucharist differs from the Sacrifice of the Cross (1st), by reason of the manner of offering it, which is unbloody ; (2nd) because in it is applied to us the price of our redemption, paid for us in full on the Altar of the Cross.

How do the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Eucharist differ ?—Though they are both produced by the same act, they differ in these two respects : 1st. The Sacrifice consists in a passing act, by which is produced and offered, the body of Christ as a victim ; whereas the Sacrament of the Eucharist consists in a thing permanent, inasmuch as the body of Christ remains under the species until they decay. 2nd. The Sacrifice of the Eucharist is principally intended for the worship of God, but the Sacrament of the Eucharist is ordained for sanctifying the soul. The Sacrament and Sacrifice, Christ whole and entire, being alike present in both, are produced by consecration.—Bossuet, in Exposition in Miss.

It is asked why the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is called "the Mass." For the Sacrifice of the Eucharist there are different appellations among ecclesiastical writers. 1st. It is called Liturgy, from a Greek word, "*Litourgia*," which signifies public service, because it is performed by a public minister and in behalf of the whole flock. 2nd. It is often called Oblation. 3rd. It is often called Synaxis, which signifies a union of the people with Christ. 4th. It is denominated Collect, even by S. Paul, from the fact that people congregate thereat to join in the service of God. 5th. It is termed "*Dominicum*," or the work of the Lord, as then a divine act is placed. 6th. Finally, it is called the Mass (*missa*), from the Latin word, *mitto*, to send, for the Catechumens were sent out before the oblation, and the faithful at the conclusion of divine service. This two-fold sending out is of the most important significance—the

first, from sending out the Catechumens, as if unworthy to assist after the oblation commenced; the second, from the fact that the assisting deacons, in the name of the Church, announced to the people that they may now depart, as divine service was finished, the sacrifice offered.—Bossuet, *ibid.*

ON THE PECULIARITIES OF THE EUCHARIST.

In the Temple of Jerusalem were offered sacrifices of three kinds: the holocaust, the pacific offering, the victim for sin; the object of these sacrifices was that supreme worship may be rendered to the Deity, that thanks may be returned for favours received; finally, that we may be restored to favour with God, our sins being forgiven us. Now, Catholics believe all those objects to be realized (those advantages), to be gained in the Eucharist as a sacrifice; they believe it is most calculated to do homage to God, most apt to enable them to return thanks for his favours. To prove this it is not necessary, as both Lutherans and Calvinists allow those qualities to the supper which they celebrate; but they deny it to be propitiatory or impetratory, for so to believe would be injurious to the sacrifice of the cross they allege, by which the whole price of our redemption was paid, from which, as from a fountain, flow all the graces which man needs, and which is possible for him to obtain. It remains to be proved the Eucharistic sacrifice is propitiatory.

1st. From Scripture, *i. e.*, from the words of Institution, there, of necessity, is a propitiatory sacrifice, where there is a victim offered to God, and blood shed for the remission of sins, and the words of Christ, spoken at the last supper, announce these blessed attributes to be found in the Eucharist, "this is my body which is given for you, this chalice (is) the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you," (Luke 19). S. Matthew adds, "for the remission of sins;" it has been already proved these words refer to the Eucharist. S. Paul writes, "every high priest is ordained for men, in those which belong to God, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins," (Heb. 5), and consequently when Christ instituted his vicars here on earth, he intended they would offer *for sins*, by celebrating the same sacrifice he offered and celebrated.

THE EUCHARIST IS A PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE, PROVED FROM TRADITION.

Origin.—In Homily 13 on Leviticus, says of the Eucharist: "It is the only commemoration which makes God propitious to men." Cyril, of Jerusalem, in the last number of his Catechism writes: "The sacrifice which Christ offers *we offer* for our sins, believing the clement God thus becomes merciful and propitious to us." S. Ambrose writes: "In the Eucharist Christ offers himself as priest, that he may forgive us sins." S. Jerome writes: "What is to be thought of prelates who every day offer spotless victims to God, both for their own sins and those of the people." With these testimonies, the following words of S. J. Crystostom accord: "How holy must he be, who, for the city, yea,

for the whole Church, acts the intercessor, supplicating God he may be propitious to all on account of their sins." S. Augustine (in lib. *deceret Dei*) writes: "To the sacrifices of the ancient law, this one sacrifice is preferred, for in it a true remission of sins takes place." That the sacrifice of the Eucharist is propitiatory is learned from the consent of all churches, this consent is ascertained from the Liturgies of both Greeks and Latins, not excepting Schismatics, in all which it is affirmed the sacrifice (of the Eucharist) is offered, "that God may forgive us our sins;" this is the doctrine of the Fathers of the Council of Trent, who defined the sacrifice of the Eucharist to be truly propitiatory, "reconciled to him by this oblation, the Lord, conferring grace and the gifts of repentance, remits also crimes and great sins;" they moreover add, "this victim is the same, and *he*, who, by the ministry of priests, offers himself, *is the same* as he who offered himself on the cross, the manner of offering being different." However, it is to be observed, according to the definition of the Fathers of Trent, the sacrifice of the mass doth not immediately and directly forgive sins, as baptism and penance, but *indirectly*, by obtaining for us the helps of grace and the gift of repentance. The sacrifice of the Eucharist is impetratory, *i. e.*, through it we obtain favours both spiritual and temporal; that spiritual gifts may be obtained through the Eucharist, and are obtained through it, is manifest from what has been said in the preceding proposition.

The same may be affirmed in regard to temporal blessings, for if the sacrifices of the old law availed for obtaining them, and this is undeniable, *e. g.*, from the victims which King David offered to drive pestilence away (2 b. K., c. 4) from the sacrifice which Malichias offered, that the life of the impious Hebedorus may be spared (11 Mach., c. 3); to obtain the like temporal blessings, why would not the excellent sacrifice be deemed efficacious? "of which the ancient sacrifices were but *the figure*," as the Apostle Paul (1 Tim., c. 2) teaches.

"It is good and acceptable before our Saviour prayers and supplications be made for all men, for Kings, for all high in authority (in sublimitate potestatis), that they may lead a quiet, peaceful life in all piety and chastity." Here, verily, prayers are said to be acceptable to God to obtain temporal blessings, and not any prayer should be deemed more acceptable to him than that, in which Christ intercedes for us in the Eucharist, to which we join ours; through it, then, (the Eucharist), we can ask for temporal blessings with a well-founded hope of obtaining them, if they contribute to our salvation.

From the earliest times prayers were offered in the celebration of the Eucharist for obtaining temporal blessings; this knowledge we have acquired from Tertulian, who died at the advanced age of 81, A. D. 218, and therefore spent by far the greater part of a long life in the age preceding that of the Apostles, in his 2nd book, "*de Scapula*," he writes: "Sacrifice is offered in behalf of the Emperor." Eusebius writes: "For Constantine and his sons, for the peace of the whole world, sacrifice is offered." (*Book 4, Life of Const.*), "for the general peace of the Church sacrifice is offered." Writes Cyril, of Jerusalem,

"I would have the initiated know;" writes S. J. Chrysostum, Hom. 6, 1 Tim., "how, every day, morning and evening we make entreaties for the peaceful government of the whole world, for our soldiers and allies, for those who labour under infirmities, for those who are oppressed with diseases, for all in fine who need help;" that in all preceding ages prayers were made during the celebration of the Eucharist for obtaining spiritual and temporal blessings alike, is demonstrated from the fact that the Lord's Prayer, which includes all spiritual and temporal necessities, was always recited.

It may be asked how the sacrifice of the Eucharist operates? 1st. It doth not directly remit sins, as to guilt and punishment, as they are remitted by the Sacraments; but indirectly, inasmuch as it obtains the grace of God for persons to be moved to a conversion of heart, and to receive the Sacraments with profit. 2nd. The sacrifice of the Mass operates *ex opere operato*, i.e., it produces its salutary effects through a virtue inherent in the divine act itself, independent of the disposition of the officiating priest; "that pure oblation cannot in any way be tarnished by the unworthiness or malice of those who offer it."—Con. Trid, Sess. xxii., c. 2. The efficacy of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is not derived from the devotion of him for whom it is offered, otherwise it would possess no more inherent virtue than any other good work, which would not be true to say; besides, it is advantageously offered for the dead, who are incapable of any merit of their own. *Note*—On the part of the celebrating minister some greater efficacy might accrue to the Sacrifice, *ex opere operantis*, on account of his more fervent prayer. In this respect alone, the Mass offered by a pious priest may be said to avail more than the Mass offered by an impious priest.—Tournely.

It is asked if the fruit (value) of the Mass is infinite. Its fruit is infinite, as to sufficiency, on account of the dignity of the Victim, but finite as to efficacy, or way of applying its fruit to us. This is manifestly true from the practice of the Church, which permits the sacrifice of the Mass to be repeatedly offered, that the same favors may be obtained; also from the decrees of Popes, which forbid a priest receiving many stipends for Masses, *to discharge all* by the offering of *one*, they denounce to the priest who in his cupidity would so act, "he would sin against justice and was bound to restitution." If it be asked why it is so, when the dignity of the Victim and the principal Offerer are infinite in value—Answer: 1st. The supreme will of God has so ordained it. 2nd. That the Sacrifice, without which religion could not be maintained, would be more frequented. 3rd. Because the order of Divine Providence requires it, the order by which it happens, Christ does not cease to intercede for us in heaven. Another reason, that the infinite price which he paid for us on the cross, and through which the world is saved, may not be applied to us but at certain seasons, according to a certain measure, and through diverse instruments of grace. 5th. Thus God wishes to promote (to stimulate) our zeal, our diligence, our efforts, so that in proportion to the measure of our piety and devotion,

we would derive greater or less fruit from the Sacrifice.—Idem in Major, Prolect.

Whence is derived the application, viz., the amount of fruit coming from the Sacrifice of the Mass? 1st. From the merciful will of God. 2nd. From the general intention of the Church, for whose good this Sacrifice was instituted; from the special intention of the sacrificing or officiating minister; from the particular devotion of Him for whom it is offered. The will of God is inscrutable. The general intention of the Church is ascertained from her Liturgies (public service); from these we learn the Sacrifice of the Mass is offered "for all the faithful, living and dead, for the salvation of the whole world, for all who are in power." The intention of the minister should include all, for whom by virtue of office, or on account of stipend, he is obliged to offer the sacrifice. Finally, although the Mass operates *ex opere operato*, generally speaking, its effect is greater or less, according to the disposition of those for whom it is offered. I said "generally speaking," because the Eucharistic Sacrifice celebrated for a sinner who thinks not of his soul nor of doing penance, often by the grace of God produces the desired effect—is often attended with the conversion of the poor erring child of the Church.

Assisting devoutly at Mass procures for us blessings without number, both temporal and spiritual. It is written in Scripture, the Lord blessed Obededum and all his substance, because he lodged the ark in his house—"Benedixit Dominus Obededum, et omnia ejus propter eam" (2 Kings, vi., 12). What then may we not expect he will do in favour of a devout soul, affected with lively feelings of religion, towards the sacramentary mysteries of which the ark was but a figure? Sinners will receive thence the spirit of penance and compunction; the just, new fervour in the service of God. "The Eucharist was the source of zeal to the Apostles, of strength to martyrs, of light to doctors, of sanctity to confessors, and of purity to virgins. It is the sanctification of Christian souls, the happiness and glory of the Church, the treasures of God's goodness, *benignitatis Dei thesaurus*, in which the oppressed find a resource in their adversity, the feeble, the sick, support and consolation in their infirmities; it is the treasure whence God effuses on us the riches of his mercy."—S. J. Chrysostum, Hom. 3.

Let us then assist at this holy sacrifice every day—or at least as often as it is conveniently possible for us—but let us assist at it devoutly; let us attend with as much modesty, piety and faith, as may render us worthy at the awful hour of death to reap and gather in the last fruit of this sacrifice, which is to possess that glory and felicity which Jesus Christ, who is there offered for our salvation, has merited for us by his sacred death and passion. Amen.

P.S.—Christ, the celebrating minister, the society of the faithful, combine in offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, but in a different manner, for Christ offers as the principal and primary priest, the celebrating minister, as real priest; but secondary, and as Christ's vicar, the faithful offer in will, desire, and in spiritual union with the celebrating minister.

1st. That Christ is principal and primary priest, follows from the pre-

...ive he enjoys, "of being alone priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisadech," who therefore alone, as primary priest, must to the consummation of the world offer this sacrifice. "It was becoming we should have a high priest, holy, innocent, undefiled, separated from sinners, made higher than the heavens, who hath not necessity every day as the priests of the old law to offer victims, first for his sins, then for the people" (Ep. Heb., c. 7); this refers no less to the Eucharist than to the sacrifice of the cross, with which it is the same in substance, and, therefore, in offering the Eucharist, Christ is the principal (primary) priest; so all the Holy Fathers understand it, as they acknowledge him to be both priest and victim.

2d. Priests alone who are validly ordained, can offer this sacrifice to them. J. Christ spoke the following words: "This do in commemoration of me;" to them he gave power and issued a command to consecrate the Eucharist. Now these words were solely addressed to the Apostles and to their successors in the priesthood, to wit, Bishops and Presbyters; they alone then have the power of offering the sacrifice of the Eucharist. This we likewise learn from tradition; St. Justin (*in prim. Apol. pro Christ*), writes: "To him who presides over the brethren, is offered bread and a cup of wine mixed with water, which, he receiving, performs the Eucharist." Tertulian writes: "The Eucharist is not to be received but from the hands of those who preside, much less is it to be consecrated by any" (but by them). They who presided were Bishops and Presbyters. St. Jerome proves the Luciferans not to belong to the true Church, from the fact of their not having priests to consecrate the Eucharist, "*neque Episcopos, neque Presbyteros, habent epistol.*" This sacrament, no person can offer unless a priest (*sacerdos*), duly ordained, we are taught by the Council IV. of Later, A.D. 1215. To confirm this doctrine, the Council of Trent (*sess. 22, de sacrif. miss.*) has hurled the thunderbolts of heaven against all gainsayers fulminating the following scathing anathema: "If any person will say, Christ when he spoke these words, '*hoc facite in meam commemorationem*,' (sec. 22), did not ordain his Apostles priests, or did not intend they and other priests would offer his body and blood, let him be anathema." The faithful may be said in a threefold sense to offer.

1st. In a general way, inasmuch as they are members of the Church in the name of which the priest offers.

2nd. In a special manner, so far as they co-operate with the celebrating minister, e. g., by asking for, by procuring the sacrifice to be applied to themselves, by donating "the celebrant" an honorary, by ministering unto him.

3rd. Because by internal affection, they unite themselves "to the action of the priest," and seek to be partakers of its fruit; hence, the priest before beginning the canon in which is comprised "the action of the sacrifice," turning to the people, says in a loud voice, "*Orate fratres*," &c., i. e., "pray brethren, that my sacrifice and yours be made acceptable to God, the Father Almighty;" and, "within the action," he says: "This oblation of our service, and of thy whole family, we beseech Thee, Lord, that propitious you receive;" and whereas, sacrifice from its nature, is the public and solemn worship of the people. In the name of the people it is to be offered to God. "What is performed in a special manner by the ministry of the priest, the same is done in a general way by the wish of the people," writes Pope Innocent III.

May 21, 1872.